

Occasional Communion

Fundamentally Destructive of the

*Discipline of the Primitive
Catholick Church,*

And Contrary to the

Doctrine of the *Latest Scriptures,*

CONCERNING

Church-Communion.

By HENRY DODWELL, M. A.

L O N D O N,

Printed for S. Keble, at the *Turk's Head* in
Fleetstreet, and R. Smith, at the *Angel* and
Bible without *Temple-Bar*. 1705.

Geographical Commission

Foundation of the

Geographical Commission

The Geographical Commission

Geographical Commission

Geographical Commission

Geographical Commission

Geographical Commission

Geographical Commission

Geographical Commission

Geographical Commission

Geographical Commission

Geographical Commission

Geographical Commission

Geographical Commission

Geographical Commission

Geographical Commission



THE CONTENTS.

THE Occasional Communion here
disputed is not meant of differ-
ent Churches of the same Com-
munion, but of Occasional Commu-
nion with different Churches of
different Communion. Page 1

That Occasional Communion with oppo-
site Communion is defended by our
Adversaries. P. 4

This Occasional Communion is incon-
sistent with the Principles which
were fundamental to all the Disci-
pline of the purest Ages. P. 6

The Principles that were so funda-
mental to that Discipline could
hardly possibly fail of being true;
but must certainly be surer than any
modern Reasonings from the sacred
Text at this distance. P. 12

The Contents.

It was long before the Christians were an entire Communion from even the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem; not till the end of the History of the Acts of the Apostles. P. 17

The Apostles and first Christians were at first zealous for the Law as well as the unbelieving Jews themselves, and therefore not likely to communicate with the Temple, only occasionally. P. 27

St. Paul acted consonantly to the Rules of constant Communion with the Temple, both in circumcising St. Timothy, and in refusing to circumcise Titus. P. 37

The Christians as reputed a Heresy were not therefore a distinct Communion from the Temple. P. 41

The Case of the Essenes how reconcilable with the Communion of the Temple. As also that of St. James the chief Apostle. P. 42

The Breach of Communion between the Jews and the Christians was made by the Sanhedrin, a little before the Destruction of their Temple. P. 55

This was made by the Sanhedrin between the Year LXIII. and LXVI.

P. 61
St.

The Contents.

St. Paul's Compliances not with the unbelieving, but the believing Jews of Jerusalem, was nothing like the Occasional Communion with an opposite Communion defended by our Non-conformists. P. 74

The Anathematisms denounc'd against the Christians by the Sanhedrin were they, if any thing, that broke off the Communion of the Christian Jews with the Temple-worship. P. 81

Before this Breach, the Communion of the Jewish Christians with the Jews in the Temple was constant: After, their Communion with the unbelieving Jews was unlawful. In neither Case only occasional. p. 88

'Till this Breach was made, there was no reason to expect a distinct Account of the particular Nature of the Christian Communion. p. 98

The properest Season for expecting this Account was in the latter end of the Age of the Apostles. P. 101

The latest Scriptures are clear against the Doctrine of Occasional Communion. P. 107

And that by the certainest way of interpreting their true Sense, rather from their Principles than from naked Facts. P. 114

St.

The Contents,

St. John's whole Reasoning supposes them in Communion with the Devil, who are out of the true Communion. P. 122

So the Jews also, after their Breach of Communion with the Christians, are called the Synagogue of Satan. P. 129

The Discipline of the Church, in the purest Times, suppos'd, even the best moral Livers, when out of the true Communion, under the Power of the Devil. P. 137

The Reasonings of the Scriptures own no mean between being in the Communion of the Church, and under the Power of the Devil. P. 141

All Mankind enslav'd to the Devil by Original Sin, not delivered from that Slavery but by Christ, who has purchas'd that Deliverance only for his Elect, as a visible Body. P. 147

However Christ only intended this Deliverance for all Men, on Condition of their becoming Members of his visible Church. P. 151

This is perfectly agreeable to the Sense of those Philosophers, whose Phraseology is principally us'd and alluded to in the Revelations of the New Testament in this Matter. P. 156

By

The Contents.

By the same Principles, as own'd by the Sacred Writers themselves, it appears that unbaptiz'd Persons are suppos'd to be still under the Power of the Devil. p. 163

By the same Principles, the Condition of a Communicant, leaving the true Communion faultily, is worse than if he had never enter'd into it. p. 170

The casting off all the visible Authority of a Jurisdiction (especially when it is not pretended to be in favour of a rival Power, which may pretend a better Right, by the Laws of the Succession) is not reconcilable with our owning our Subjection to God, and Christ himself. And therefore is by fair Interpretation, according to Scripture Reasonings, a revolting to him, who (by the same Scripture Principles) is suppos'd to Head all Oppositions to God and his Christ. p. 180

The Case of Occasional Communion is real Prevarication, though the Communicants be not conscious of their being guilty of it. p. 187

Occasional Communion is not really the way to Peace and Union, but downright Hostility. p. 196

The Contents.

Occasional Communicants, by their still retaining their Hostile Principles, are the more dangerous to the Church for their being numerous whilst they are own'd as Members of the Church.

p. 202

An Address to the Bishops.

p. 206

ADVERTISEMENT.

In a short time will be Publish'd,

A Conference between the Soul and the Body, shewing the Difference of Religion as practis'd now, and the Customs of the Primitive Christians. Recommended to the World by Mr. Henry Dodwell, M. A. Printed for R. Smith at the *Angel and Bible* without *Temple-Bar.* 8vo. Price 3 s.

Occa-

Occasional Communion

Fundamentally Destructive of the

*Discipline of the Primitive
Catholick Church,*

And Contrary to the

Doctrine of the *latest Scriptures,*

CONCERNING

Church-Communion.

IN this Dispute concerning *Occa-
sional Communion*, we ought ac-
curately to distinguish between
Occasional Communion with *dis-
ferent Churches* of the *same Communi-
on*, and Occasional Communion with
several Churches of *different Communi-
ons*. The *former* Case none questions,

B

that

I.
The Occasi-
onal Com-
munion
here dispu-
ted is not
meant of
different
Churches
of the same
Communi-
on, but of
Occasional

Communi-
on with
different
Churches
of different
Communi-
ons.

that I know of. *Stated Communion* (as they call it) is generally *confined* within, at least, the *Diocesan District* within which the Communicant *lives*. I do not mention *Parochial* Districts of *single Assemblies*, which, being *Prudential*, neither *were* from the *Beginning*; nor, even yet, have prevail'd *Universally*. Particularly our Neighbours of the *United Provinces* are unacquainted with any Appropriation of *single Presbyters* to *Parochial Churches*. The same is the Case of many *other* Protestants, especially of the *Calvinists*. The Communicating therefore of such Persons with any *other* Churches can be no other than *occasional*, as the private Affairs of the *Communicants* oblige them to *travel* beyond the Bounds of their own *Diocesan Districts*. Exactly like that of the *Primitive Church* over all Churches in the *Christian World* by the Commerce of the *Literæ formatæ*. They who stay'd at *home* never communicated with any *other* Church but that *one* to which they were particularly related as *Inhabitants* of a *particular District*. And their *actual* Communion with *other* Churches depended wholly on their *Journies*, which were only *occasional*.

Against Occasional Communion.

3

casional. But this never allow'd them the Liberty of *different Communions* occasionally, as it is practis'd by our Adversaries in this Dispute. If they were to *remove* their Settlements, they then communicated as *statedly* with *those Churches* where they *fixed* their *Residence*, as they had done *formerly* in the Churches to which they were particularly intitled by their *Baptism*: And they thought themselves *obliged* to do so by the Principles of *Catholick Communion*, by which the *Catholick Commerce* was managed in those earlier Ages. Their professing themselves Members of those *foreign Churches* oblig'd them to *abstain* from all *opposite* Communions to that of the *Jurisdiction* they liv'd in, as severely as the like professing themselves Members of the *Church* into which they had been *baptized* had oblig'd them within the *Districts* of their *native* Communion. It obliged them to as strict a Submission to the Determinations of the *local Ecclesiastical Authority* in Things not *sinful*, as when they were at *home*. It *obliged* them to as severe a *Forbearance* of all *Communions* maintain'd within the *same Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*, in *Opposition* to the *local Ecclesiastical*

Against Occasional Communion.

Authority. It *restrained* them as much from *foreign* Communion, to which the *local* Bishop could *not* recommend them by his *communicatory Letters*. No *other* Bishops would receive them to their *own* Communion, without the *communicatory Letters* of the *local* Bishop of the *Jurisdiction* in which they liv'd. Nor would *that* Bishop give them his *communicatory Letters* to any but such as were in *Communion* with *himself*: That is, to none but *such* Bishops as *owned* his *own* Communicants on an *Attestation* that they were in *Communion* with *him*; and who accordingly *rejected* his *Excommunicates* who could *not* produce such an *Attestation*.

II.
That Occasional
Communion with
opposite Communi-
ons is de-
fended by
our Adversaries.

This was all the *Occasional Communion* allow'd, not only in the *Primitive*, but the *Apostolical* Church; or indeed by any who *truly* understood the *nature* of *Communion* in *those* Ages when it was *best* understood and *practiced*. But this is nothing to the *Case* for which our *Adversaries* are concern'd: They are for *Occasional Communion* with *opposite Communion*s in the *same* *Districts* in which they found us *possess'd* who first *departed* from us. They are for *Occasional Communion* with

Against Occasional Communion.

5

with the *Rebels* against our Communion, who receive our *Excommunicates*, and think themselves under no *Obligation* to receive our *Communicants* on account of their being *owned* by us, nor indeed to *ratifie* any Act of the *Government* of that *Body* into which we are *incorporated* by our *Communion*. They are for *Occasional Communion* with those *Rebels* not only against our *Bishops*, but against *Episcopacy* it self: Even *whiles* they have formed themselves into *distinct Bodies*, exercising *actual Hostilities* against us, seducing *Profelytes* from us, and teaching a *Contempt* of all our *Spiritual Coercions*, and *justifying* their *Separations* by *Principles* that may *perpetuate* them, and encourage *others* to *divide* and *justifie* new *Separations*, as often as the *Spiritual Power* shall provoke *Flesh* and *Blood* to separate by the due *Exercise* of its own *lawful Authority*. They are for *Occasional Communion* with those who are not content to keep their *new Opinions* to themselves, but think themselves *oblig'd* to *ruin* the *Episcopacy* derived from the *Apostles*, and that by *Principles*: With those, who, by doing so, are for *ruining* all *lasting* and *obliging Principles* of *Uni-*

ty and firm Communion, and leave all at liberty, whether they will, or will not, maintain any one Communion: With those who thereby would, by Catholick Doctrine, dissolve the Tie that makes Us one Body and one Communion with each other, and therefore much more with them. This is to give up Unity in hopes of Unity, to betray a Unity by Principles, for a Prospect of a Unity in a Confederacy for present temporary secular Designs, which can hold us no longer than the Humours of our Deceivers, and, when they are expir'd, will leave us utterly destitute of Uniting Principles with regard to Conscience. To this God may, in his Justice, leave us, if He think fit to punish us with strong Delusions for not receiving his Truth in the Love of it, and preferring our own Inventions before his Divine Institutions.

III.

This Occasional Communion is inconsistent with the Principles which were fundamental to all the Discipline of the purest Ages

But it is impossible for our Adversaries to justify their licentious Practices of this kind by any Principles, or allow'd Practices of those Times, wherein the Nature and Design of Communion was best understood, and the Discipline of Communion was most severely practis'd. I know no one single Instance wherein Occasional Communion

munion was even *excus'd*, where *con-* which im-
stant Communion may be had, I do not mediately
 say, with a *particular Church*, but with succeeded
 a *particular Communion*. And most the Apo-
 certainly it *may* be had by Persons stles.
residing in the same *Jurisdiction*, which
 is the Case wherein our Adversaries
 are concern'd. I know not one single
 Instance, wherein *Occasional Com-*
munion with an *opposite Communion* was
 ever *allow'd*; or wherein those *Com-*
munions were not *thought opposite*, who
 did not *receive* each others *Communi-*
cants, and *reject* each others *Excom-*
municates, and who pretended *Inde-*
pendency on each other within the *same*
Jurisdictions. I know no one single
 Instance, wherein such *Occasional Com-*
munion with an *opposite Communion*
 was ever defended on such *Reasons* as
 our Adversaries insist on, of *purser Wor-*
ship, or *greater Edification*. These Con-
 siderations might indeed have been
 thought useful in a *Choice* where *Choice*
 was *lawful*, of a *purser* or *more edify-*
ing Assembly among many others of
 the *same Communion*. But no truly
Primitive Catholick Principles would
 ever have allow'd either *Purity* or *E-*
edification in Assemblies of *opposite Com-*
munions, which might make them ca-

8 *Against Occasional Communion.*

pable even of a *Competition* with the most *imperfect* Assemblies of the *one true Communion*. The Doctrine then universally receiv'd in the whole *diffusive Church*, was that the *Orthodox Communion* alone was that which was entitl'd to have its *Communions* and *Excommunications* ratify'd in *Heaven*, as alone obliging the *Archetypal Bishop* of our *Souls*, and thereby conveying a *Right* to its *Communicants*, to all the *Merits* of *Christ*, and the *Heavenly Benefits* of *Mystical Communion*: That all other *Communions* divided from her were for that reason *presum'd* to be divided from the *Heavenly Communion*, and therefore divided from *God* and *Christ*, and all the *Benefits* of the *Mystical Communion* in *Heaven*: That the *Visible Sacraments* were the *Bonds* of this *External Union*, so that they who were *united* in the *Sacraments* were *united* in the *Orthodox Communion*; and they who had *separate Sacraments* proper to their own *Sect* were therefore suppos'd to be divided from that *one Communion*, without which it was *impossible* to have any *solid Claim* to the *Rights* of the *Heavenly Communion*: That both the *Sacraments* were *Rites* of *Incorporation* into those

those *Bodies* wherein they were receiv'd, whereby the Communicants profess'd, and made, themselves *Members* of those *Societies* whose *Sacraments* were receiv'd by them; and, on the contrary, *divided* from all other *Bodies* not united to them in common *Sacraments*: That therefore one single *Act* of *Sacramental Communion*, with any *divided Bodies* from the one *Orthodox Communion*, was alone sufficient to *divide* the Communicant from that *priviledg'd Body*, which could alone entitle to the *Benefits* of the *Cælestial Communion*. On these *Principles* it is very manifest how impossible it was, for those who reason'd on them, to allow of the *Occasional Communion* with *opposite Bodies*, for which our Adversaries plead. Yet those were the *Fundamental Principles* of all that *Discipline*, which was then universally exercis'd with great *Severity*. These made their Communicants dread a Sentence of *Excommunication* more than all the *Power* of the *Secular Magistrate*, or any other whatsoever *worldly Consideration*. These made them willing to *atone* for their *scandalous Sins* by many *Years Austerities*, inflicted for them by the *Canon*s

nons of those happy glorious Times; nor is it ever to be expected that that *Discipline* can be retriev'd, (which our *Church* owns is much to be wish'd) 'till these *Opinions* be retriev'd, and as *universally* receiv'd by every *Individual* Member of our *Church*, as they were *then*. I am sure it cannot be expected from the loose Notions of the *Latitudinarians* and our modern *Schismatics*. All the *Obligation* they can pretend on *Christ* to *ratifie* in *Heaven* the *Ecclesiastical Sentences* of our *Ecclesiastical Judges* on *Earth*, is only deriv'd from the *Merit* of the *Causes* wherein they are pronounc'd, of which every *new Ecclesiastical Judicatory*, and even the *Criminals* themselves, even in their *own Cases*, are allow'd to *judge* in order to the *Obligation* it may lay on the *private Consciences* to submit them. There are very few *Cases* that can afford an *Evidence* sufficient to *oblige* all *Superiours* of one *single Jurisdiction* to be of one *Mind*, both as to *Fact* and *Right* in one *single Case*. Fewer yet that can oblige *several* *Judicatories* to be so on *reiterated Trials*: And yet fewer that can do so where the *Judicatories* are *numerous*, and the *Trials* cannot all proceed on
present

present Evidences, but *Reports* either from the *Criminals* themselves, or the first concern'd *Judicatories*. This way of proceeding will very rarely, if ever, oblige *Criminals* to be of the same *Mind* with their fallible *Superiors* when they make against them; yet without obliging them to be so, they cannot, in this way of proceeding, oblige their *Consciences*. This we find, by *Experience*, makes *Ecclesiastical Authority* the most precarious of any that is lodg'd in fallible *Persons*. Yet we cannot believe but that *Christ*, who instituted the *Authority*, took Care that this *Authority*, as it is more valu'd by him, should be more rever'd by the *Subject*, proportionably to the momentousness of the *Society* for which it is design'd, beyond all other, whatsoever *Humane Societies*. And so it does on the true *Catholick Doctrine* now describ'd, of general *Delegation* empowering our particular *Ecclesiastical Superiors* to oblige *Christ*, and precluding all other *Judicatories* from a new *Trial* of the same *Causes*. So infinitely wiser are the *Settlements* of *Christ* and his *Apostles*, as discoverable from the consentient *Tradition* of the next *Ages*, than the uncertain *Reasonings* from the Sa-
cred

cred Historical Books, at the distance of near Seventeen Centuries, by those who designedly exclude the help of that Tradition: That very Consideration makes the Hypothesis now mention'd far more likely than any of our pretended new Discoveries.

IV.
The Principles that were so Fundamental to that Discipline could hardly possibly fail of being true; but must certainly be surer than any modern Reasonings from the sacred Text at this distance.

These Principles so destructive of the licentious Notions of Occasional Communion so lately introduc'd by our Adversaries, can hardly fail of being Apostolical, though they had no other Evidence of their being so, than their being receiv'd universally in the next Ages to the Apostles, and then being Fundamental to all the Discipline that was exercis'd in those most exemplary Ages. This Evidence alone far exceeds those of the modern Systeme fitted to the Singularities of each single Sect, from Scriptures far from being express for the purposes for which they are produc'd, and conjectural Reasonings from those Scriptures precariously taken up by the first celebrated Authors of the several Divisions and Subdivisions, with a design'd neglect of what might have been produc'd for clearing the Apostle's Minds from the consentient Testimonies of the first and purest, and least exceptionable,

Foun-

Fountains of *Apostolical Tradition*. And it ought to be allow'd the force of what *Tertullian* (in the Language of the *Roman Laws*) calls a *Prescription*, for silencing so weak *Reasonings* from the *Sacred Text*, as those are which are produc'd by our Adversaries, though its Pretensions from the *Scriptures* themselves had been no stronger than those on which our Adversaries are pleas'd to insist. Those earliest Ages had all the helps of *Scripture* that we can pretend to now, but withal far more helps for understanding them than can be pretended at this distance. The Language of the *New Testament* it self was then a *living Language*, understood by *Rusticks* and *Mechanicks* then, better than it can be now by our most learned Men, who must now attain it by *Grammar*, and the assistance of *Authors* as remote from our popular Capacities as the *Scriptures* themselves. The *Terms* of *Art*, and the *Circumstances* for which they are design'd by the *Sacred Writers* and the *Holy Ghost* himself, together with the *Errors* alluded to and confuted by them, were then so little obscur'd by *Antiquity*, that every Idiot who had only so much Conversation
in

in *worldly* Affairs and *Facts*, as might fit him for the Employment by which he was to earn his *Livelihood*, might then know more of the *Apostle's Design* in every particular *Scripture*, than can now be retriev'd by the greatest *Diligence* and *Sagacity* of our most learned *Commentators*. Our Adversaries themselves find how difficult it is to determine from the *Scriptures* what *Government* was left in the Church by the *Apostles*, and how miserably *they* are divided in their *Opinions* concerning it, of which it was impossible for any *Incorporated* Christian to be ignorant *then*. So *small* a share it is of what *every* Christian then knew that can now be recover'd by the most exquisite *Learning*. Not now to mention the many ways they had *then* for knowing the *Apostles* Minds, independent on the *Scriptures*, which we neither have, nor can with any *Diligence* retrieve, in these *later* Ages. They had *Traditional* Memoirs of the *old* Men who had receiv'd their Doctrine from the *Apostles* themselves, and early *Witnesses* of those *Memoirs*, from those who, in the *fresh*est Memory of them, travell'd purposely to gather them before they were forgotten. When these
were

were gone, they *still* had *living* Witnesses of what had been *collected* by them, and *Books* of some of them, though *now* lost, *preserving* their Observations in their *own Words*, less liable to mistake than when their *Sense* only was convey'd in the *Words* of *others* who might *misunderstand* them. These *Advantages* we, at this *distance*, cannot pretend to. And where *all* the *Apostolical Churches* were agreed, it was hardly *possible* they could be *mistaken*, by the *Demonstrative Reasonings* of *Tertullian* in his *Prescriptions*. I need not here repeat (what I have elsewhere urg'd in my *Two First Diss.* on *Irenaeus*) for proving the *Credibility* of the *Testimony* of those *first Ages*, as to their *Extraordinary Attestations*, as well as their *Ordinary Means* for deriving *Traditions* from the *Apostles*, far exceeding what our *ablest Adversaries* can *pretend* to. It is here a very considerable Advantage, beyond the *Unanimity* of their *Attestation*, that the *Doctrine* now insisted on was *fundamental* to all the *Discipline* of those *earlier Ages*. It is therefore very incredible, that either the *Holy Spirit*, or the *Sacred Writers*, could have been *obscure* in an *Affair* of

of so extream *Importance* for the Good of the *Society* and *Government* which had been settled by them. It is further *incredible*, that, if the *Revelation* concerning it had been *clear*, and *designed clear* to the *Capacities* of those *Ages* who were *originally* intrusted to derive it to *Posterity*, it could have been at all *mistaken* by them, much more that the *Mistake* could have been then *universal*, and that they could have *agreed* in any *one* way of *Misunderstanding* it. These Things prove such a *Mistake* very *unlikely*; I am sure incomparably *more unlikely*, than that our *Adversaries*, or the *first* Authors of their several respective *Schisms*, should have been *mistaken* in their *Reasonings* at so great a *Distance* in a studious design'd *Neglect* of these *best* Expedients for *deriving* Apostolical *Traditions*. But neither is that all that is considerable in our present Case: The many *Divine Attestations* usual in those *Ages* in Confirmation and Ratification of the *Discipline* then *practiced*, are, I should think, *irrefragable Proofs* that the *Discipline* then *practiced* was indeed from God, and not grounded on any *Personal Misunderstandings* of those who had *derived* it to them. This

This *Advantage* we have of our Adversaries from this *Presumption* alone, for proving the true sense of the *Apostles* beyond their *conjectural Reasonings* from the *Scriptures*; even though our *Catholick Doctrine* had not been mention'd in the *Scriptures*: It might notwithstanding ~~have~~ been revealed by the *Apostles*, though it had not been expressly mention'd in the *Sacred History* of the *New Testament*, if it were revealed after the writing and collecting the *Sacred Historical Books*. And yet it might have been proved to have been revealed by *them* by the Topick now insisted on, though it had not been written in those Books which were written before the *Apostles* had receiv'd that *Revelation*. The *History* of the *Acts* brings the *Apostolical History* no lower than St. *Paul's* first *Captivity* in *Rome*, several Years before his own *Martyrdom*; which is the utmost *Period* of the same *History*, as it may be traced from the *incidental Passages* of his *Epistles*. The same *Epocha* I take for the utmost *Bounds* of St. *Peter's* Writings also, who suffered at the same Time with him, in the Tenth Year of *Nero*, in the Year of our vulgar Account LXIV. near XL.

v.

It was long before the Christians were an entire Communion from even the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem; not till the End of the History of the Acts of the Apostles.

C

Years,

Years, at least, before the Death of the last Apostles. After this we have no Account in the Sacred History what was done by the Apostles, but what can be gather'd from occasional Allusions of the Catholick Epistles or Revelations: Our Adversaries therefore cannot reason negatively from the Silence of those Writings, against the Divine Revelations that might have been made to the Apostles afterwards. It is a great Mistake, though commonly receiv'd, that all Divine Revelations were made to the Apostles at one Time: No, not upon their Reception of the Spirit in Pentecost. That Spirit did indeed, as was promised, lead them into all Truth, but by slow Degrees, and as even they themselves were capable of receiving it, who were themselves, as well as others, possess'd with Prejudices of their Jewish Education against the great Change that was to be introduc'd by the Gospel-Revelations, in substituting the New Peculium into the Place and Privileges of the Old. And particularly, they were prejudiced against the Separation of Communion, which was at length occasion'd by this great Change. Their Expectation was, that the Gentiles should be still

still receiv'd into the *Peculium*, but on the old Terms, of *Incorporation* into the *Jewish Nation* by *Circumcision*, which made them *Profelytes* of *Justice*. 'Till they were so *Profelyted*, they thought them *unclean*, and unfit for *Communion* in any *Sacred Offices*. This was *St. Peter's* own Opinion, 'till he was convinced of the *contrary* by a new *Divine Revelation*, so late as the Case of *Cornelius*. This was the Sense of the *other Apostles*, when, upon his Return to *Jerusalem*, they oblig'd him to *purge* himself of his Behaviour on that Occasion, by *pleading* that same *Divine Revelation* in his own *Defence*. Whilst they were thus of the same Opinions with the *Sanhedrin*, they were, and must have thought themselves, oblig'd by *Principles* to be too of the same *Communion* with them also, not occasionally only, but *statedly* also. Their being at last divided into two *Communions* was not, as our Adversaries conceive, from the different Opinions of the *Obligingness* of *Circumcision* to those *Christians* who were *Jews* by *Nation*, but from the *Imposition* of *Circumcision* on *Gentile Profelytes*, in order to the qualifying them for a *Communion* in *Holy Offices* in the new *Peculium*.

culium. This oblig'd the *Jewish* Converts, who were of that *Opinion*, to abstain from those *Sacred Offices* to which *uncircumcis'd Gentiles* were admitted, on that very *Account*, because *Gentiles* *uncircumcis'd* were admitted to them. This *Opinion*, when it prevail'd universally, and was withal as universally drawn into *Consequence*, ended, at last, in a *Breach of Communion*. But it was long before it was drawn into *Consequence*, or was receiv'd and practis'd universally. Yet, 'till it did so, they of the *Christians*, who were *Jews* by *Nation*, were in *Communion* with the *High-Priest*, not occasionally only, but *statedly*. They never communicated with the *Samaritans*, nor with any who were divided from him; no, not so much as occasionally. And our Saviour himself declares, in his Discourse with the *Woman of Samaria*, that *Salvation* was of the *Jews*, as to that Dispute between the *Jews* and *them* concerning the *Place* of their publick *Solemnities*, even when he foretels that the *Gospel-Dispensation* was to abrogate all *Confinement* of those publick *Solemnities* to any certain *Place*, as well that of *Jerusalem* as of *Mount Gerizim*. But this
Sepa-

Separation of Communion was (as I have elsewhere shewn, in my Discourse against the great and excellent *Grotius*) by many and *slow* degrees, not 'till the *Jews* blasphem'd, nor 'till the *Apostles* had (in Obedience to the Command of their Master) *shaken off the Dust* of their Feet as a *Testimony* against them. That was a Ceremony us'd by the *Jews* themselves, as a Token of their Detestation of a *piacular* Crime, *Acts* xxii. 23. They thereby renounc'd all *Communion* with such *piacular* Persons, signifying that the *Land* it self was defiled by it, (which is a usual Expression of the *sacred Writers* themselves concerning *Crimes* of that *Nature*) and that it involv'd all that had any *voluntary* Concern with it, in a *Contagion* of the Punishment. So on the contrary the *Two Mules Burden* of the sacred *Earth* of *Palestine*, was to consecrate the *Places* where *Naaman* design'd to worship the God of *Israel* in his own Country of *Syria*. But this Practice of the *Apostles* was *local* only, and with regard to those *particular* Places where the Indignities and *Blasphemies* against the Name of their blessed Master had been offer'd. Nor did they understand their own Ob-

ligation thereby contracted otherwise, than to *forbear* the *Communion* of those particular *Cities* which were guilty of those *Blasphemies*; exactly according to the Command of our Saviour himself concerning it, who had confin'd it to that *City* and that *Place*, opposing it to the *Cities* of *Corazin* and *Bethsaida*. This therefore was not a withdrawing from the *Communion* of the whole *Nation* in the *Temple*, but of the particular *Inhabitants* of that single *City* in the worship of their *City-Synagogues*. It was in Truth a voluntary *renouncing* their *Civil Rights*, which their being cast out of the *Synagogues* by the local *Archisynagogi* was intended to *deprive* them of, who could deprive them of the *Rights* of no other *City* but their own. The *Blasphemies* of the *Rulers* of those particular *Synagogues*, which gave occasion for the shaking off the *Dust* of the *Apostles Feet* against them, were, in all likelihood, no other than those which the *Apostle* calls a *blaspheming* of the worthy *Name* by which they were call'd, and a calling *Jesus* himself *accursed*. This also appears to have been the *Practice* of the *Jews* in this *Time*, by the *Testimony* of
St.

St. *Justine Martyr*, in his *Dialogue* against *Tryphon*. The meaning of that therefore was, not only to *deprive* the *Christians* of their *Jewish Rights* belonging to them as *Jews*, by the *Favour* of those *Heathen Princes* who had *admitted* the *Jews* to those *Rights* in the *Cities* planted with *Jewish Colonies*, but also to *declare* them *unworthy* of those higher *Rights*, (in their own *Opinion*) which they might challenge as *Citizens* of the common *Metropolis* of their Nation, *Jerusalem*, to which they were *intitl'd* by their being of the *Jewish Nation*, which gave them also a *Right* to the *Privileges* of the *Peculium* and the *Holy Seed*. The *blaspheming* and *anathematizing* our blessed *Lord* was their upbraiding him with the *manner* of his *Death* by *Crucifixion*, as not only *infamous*, but *accursed* in the *Esteem* of the *Mosaic Law*. This is insisted on by *Tryphon*, as well as the *latter Rabbins*. This *Curse* they look'd on not only as *inflicting* the *Imprecation* imply'd in the *Oath*, by which they oblig'd themselves to *observe* their *Covenant* at their first *Initiation* in it, but also as a *Forfeiture* of all the *Rights* they could claim by it, as *Fellow-Citizens* of the *Metropolis*

of their whole privileg'd Nation, as *depriv'd* Persons so punish'd of the *Right*, even of being *Citizens*. So the *Romans* had their Punishments which were suppos'd *diminuere caput*, which instead of *Citizens* made them *Slaves*, for that very Reason because those Punishments were inflicted on them. Then their being *Slaves* depriv'd them of all *Rights* and *Properties*, and *Legal Claims*. In Allusion hereunto the Apostle himself implies our Saviour to have taken upon him the Form of a *Servant*, in his being obedient to the Death of the Cross, Phil. ii. 7, 8. Why so? But because *Crucifixion* was one of those Punishments which, by the *Roman Laws*, made *Servos pænæ*, and depriv'd those of the *Rights* of Free-born *Citizens* who were punish'd with it? So it was in the Case of the *κατάγεμαλα*, the *πενήματα*, the *Piacula*, those who took upon them to atone for the *Diræ* and *ἀναδέμαλα*, incurr'd by their Fellow-Citizens for their Breach of the publick Faith. The *Consuls*, who were given up to atone for the Breach of the Articles at the *Furcæ Caudinæ*, were given up naked and bound like *Slaves*, and therefore affected thenceforward to

Liv. ix. 8,
9, 10, 11,
12.

to be counted *Samnites*, not *Romans*, being like *Slaves*, *dediti noxae*, at their own Desire. Accordingly *Postumius* struck the *Roman* Embassadors, purposely to bring a *Piaculum* on the *Samnites*, which *Pontius*, the *Samnite* General, avoided, by not accepting of the *Dedition*. So the *Decii* devoted the *Enemy's* *Legions*, together with themselves, to the *Dii manes*, including themselves in the same *Body* with their *Enemies*, that they might thereby transfer the *μνῆμα*, which had been otherwise design'd for their beloved *Romans*. Yet all that single *Colony-Cities* of the *Jews* could do alone, could have no farther Effect than their own Jurisdiction, and therefore could prevail no further than to treat our *Saviour*, and all that own'd him, as no *Citizens* of the *Peculium*, by excluding them from all the *Synagogue-worship* within their own *Præcincts*. They were so far from concluding the *Sanhedrin* by their Sentence, that no other single *City* could be concluded by it, but were still at liberty to receive the *Apostles* to the *Synagogues* of their own *Districts*, notwithstanding the *damnatory* Sentences of those *Cities* which had excluded them. This therefore

fore made the *Apostles* Secession from the *Synagogue-worship* singular and partial also, and oblig'd them *only* to abstain from the *Synagogue-worship* of those single *Districts*. They still, as they had Occasion, frequented the *Synagogues* of *other Cities* with the same Freedom as other *Jews*; 'till they also, by the like *Blasphemies* and *Curses*, drew upon *themselves* the like Denunciations of *Excision* from the *Apostles*, by the same Solemnity of casting off the *Dust* of their *Feet* as a Testimony against them. Yet they were true to the *Excision*, as far as it had then proceeded: They never *communicated*, so much as *occasionally*, with the *Synagogues* of those *Cities* against which they had denounc'd *Excision*. But the *Separation* of *Communion* neither *was* nor *could* be *universal*, 'till it included the *Temple-Communion* as well as that of the *Synagogue*; 'till it was seconded by the *Sanhedrin* of *Jerusalem*, who had *alone* the Power of concluding and obliging *all* particular *Synagogues*, as well as the *local Rulers* of single *City-Synagogues*, which could not be within the *History* of the *Lives* of the *Apostles* describ'd in the *Acts*. So far, whatever *Resentments* there might

might have been between *private Persons*, nay even between the *private Synagogues* of single *Jewish Cities* and the *Christians*, which disposed the *Jews* to that *Breach of Communion* which at length follow'd from those *Resentments*; yet the *History* of the *Acts* it self shews there was a very good Understanding between the *Two Bodies*, so that still they made *one Communion* in the Opinion of the *Christians*, under the Government of the *Sanhedrin*; the *Christians* pretending to no other *Rights* than what had been allow'd to extraordinary *Prophets* by the Constitution of that very Government it self, without any the least Pretence of *Schism* in the Judgment of the *Sanhedrin*.

What can be clearer to this purpose than what we find in the *Acts*, after the time that *St. Paul* had written most of those *Epistles* which are conceiv'd clearest against the *Obligation* of the *Mosaic Law*? Chap. xxi. 21. *St. James*, the chief Apostle, acquaints *St. Paul* with the Reports the *Christian Jews* had receiv'd concerning him, as if he had taught the *Jews* to forsake *Moses*. Upon this he advises him to take upon him the Vow of a

VI.

The Apostles and first Christians were at first zealous for the Law as well as the Unbelieving Jews themselves, and therefore not likely to Communicate with the Temple, only occasionally.

Na-

Against Occasional Communion.

Nazarite, in order to the having a *Sacrifice* offer'd for him, v. 26. And with this very Design, that the *Jews* might understand that those things whereof they had been inform'd concerning him were *nothing*, but that he *himself* [as a *Jew* by *Nation*, for whom those Obligations were design'd originally by God himself] *walked orderly, and kept the Law*, v. 24. Here is a *general* Testimony, according to the Sense and Principles of those who were *zealous* for the *Law*, v. 20. that *St. Paul* was an *orderly* Observer of it. And it is the *Ritual* and *Ceremonial* Law that was concern'd in that Dispute, wherein *St. Paul* was to *purge* himself by taking on him the Vow of a *Nazarite*, purposely that he might thence have an occasion to have a *Sacrifice* offer'd for him. Both that *Vow* and that *Sacrifice* were Parts of that *Law*, not of that which was *Moral* or *Judicial*. Yet that he might stand fair in the Opinion of those who were *zealous* for the *Law*, it was requisite he should be as careful of observing all other Precepts of that *Law*, as of these. His being a *Jew* by *Nation* made him *alike* subject to *all*, and the Zeal of the *Christian Jews* had oblig'd

oblig'd *them* to a *like* Concern for his violating any other *ritual* Law. The *Curse* now mention'd, as imprecated in all their *Covenants* for observing the Law, is general, *Deut.* xxvii. 26. And it is observ'd to be so by our Apostle himself, *Gal.* iii. 10. The same is observ'd also by St. *James*, ii. 10. who gave St. *Paul* the Counsel I am speaking of: That he who kept *the whole Law*, and yet offended in one *Point*, was guilty of all; that is, if he *did* it and *justify'd* it by *Principles*, as our Adversaries think St. *Paul* did. Here St. *James's* Reasoning holds exactly, concerning the common *Authority* from whence *all* the *Laws* of this kind deriv'd their Sanction. But it would not hold so strongly if the Breach had been occasion'd only by the violence of Temptation, and had therefore been imputable rather to the *Infirmity* than the *Principles* of the Violator. It was, in truth, that former Case that was concern'd in the Dispute of that Age, which was, whether the *Mosaic* Law was still to be observ'd as a *Condition* of *Admission* into the new *Peculium*. Occasional Communion therefore, and *partial* Obedience,

dience, could not have purg'd St. Paul by these Reasonings, which were certainly agreeable to the Principles of those who were *zealous for the Law*. It could not have satisfy'd them, that there was *nothing* in the Charge of his *Defection* from the *Law*, or that it was *true* that he walked *orderly*. So far from that, as that neither St. James, nor St. Paul himself (who *own* this Reasoning) could have judg'd it satisfactory to those whose *Satisfaction* was design'd by this Conduct. Thus far therefore St. Paul was in *stated Communion* with the *Temple-worship*. Accordingly he *owns* the Authority of the *High Priest*, as a *Ruler* of his own *People*, and excuses himself for his less respectful Language to him, though provok'd thereunto by an *Abuse* of his *just* Authority, xxiii. 4, 5. yet his *Rule* was only in Affairs of *Religion*. This made the Apostle so confident in his Trial before King *Aprippa*, touching the things whereof he was *accus'd* by the *Jews*, because the King was *expert in all Customs and Questions* which were among the *Jews*, xxvi. 23. He could *not* have been so, if such a *Judge* and such *Criteria* had made *against* him; as most certainly they would,

would, if they had been conscious of any Failure he had been guilty of in his *Duty*, as a *Jew*, to the common *Sacra* of his *Nation*, which was to *Communicate* with them, not *occasionally* only, but *statedly*. Further yet, after his Arrival at *Rome*, it plainly appears in how good an Understanding he was with those of his own Nation. He sends for the *Chief* of them, and excuses himself for his *Appeal*, as done with no ill Design against their common Body, xxviii. 19. And *they*, on the other side, profess that they had not *receiv'd any Letters out of Judæa concerning him*, nor had any of their *Brethren*, that came, *shewed or spake any harm concerning him*, v. 21. Yet by what follows it appears, that they were no *Christian Converts* that were thus kind to him, when they desire to *hear him* what his *own Thoughts* were concerning Christianity, which they knew *every where* decry'd, v. 22. It hence appears that they were *Enemies of Christianity*, from whom they had receiv'd their Characters. Thus far therefore it appears, that however hard Opinions the *Jews* of the *other Sects* had of the *Doctrines* of the *Christian Religion*, and whatever hard

Treat-

Treatment the *Christians* found from those particular *Cities* and *Synagogues* which had given their Judgment against them, as deserving an *Excision* from their common *Body*; yet that the Matter had not yet proceeded so far, as that even their *Enemies* could yet disown them in *Palestine*, where the *Temple* was, or exclude the *Jewish* Converts from their *Rights* of Communicating in the common *Sacrifices*, to which they were entitled by their *Extraction*. That is, I think, an Argument that no *publick* Sentence of any *Authority*, that could conclude the whole *Body* of the old *Peculium*, had yet excluded them, which alone had *Power* to exclude them from the *Temple* Offices, which were the only ones in which that whole *Peculium* communicated. They could not therefore yet be *Two Communions*; nor could there therefore be any Temptation to a *Communion* only *occasional*. The *Gentiles*, that were *uncircumcis'd*, were never admitted to those *Sacrifices*, nor even into that part of the *Temple* where the *Sacrificial Feast* was eaten. The Evangelist purges St. *Paul* from the Charge of having brought *Trophimus*, the *Ephesian*, into the *Temple*,

Temple, Acts xxi. 29. So true St. Paul himself was to the Discipline of the *Temple*: So little occasion there was for the *occasional Communion* pretended by our Adversaries in his Case. He was not *excluded* from the *Temple-Communion* by any *Power* that could exclude him from it, as appears by the *last* Act perform'd by him whilst he was at his own Disposal, that is mention'd in the *Acts* of the *Apostles*. And he was *oblig'd* to that *Temple-Communion*, not *occasionally* only, but *statedly*, whilst he could have it, not only on Account of his *private* Duty, as being himself a *Jew* by *Nation*, but as he was *oblig'd* by his *Duty* to the *Publick*, to avoid the giving *Scandal* to the *Jewish* Christian Converts, who were *zealous* for the *Law*. Withal it is manifest, not only from the now mention'd Advice of St. *James*, the Head Apostle, but from the frequently repeated Doctrine of St. *Paul* himself, how wary the *Christian* *Governors* of that *Age* were of giving any *Offence*, even to the *Jews* themselves, when they could possibly avoid it with any *consistency* to their own avowed *Principles*. So incredible it is, that St. *Paul* could be guilty of making

D his

his *Temple-Communion* only *occasional*, before the *end* of the *History* of the *Acts* of the *Apostles*, whilst the *Jews* *owned*, and he made *use* of his *Right* to *communicate* in the *Temple Sacrifices*. Much more incredible it is, that he should have done it, before *himself*, or his *Fellow-Apostles*, had receiv'd those *Revelations* which *chang'd* their own *Opinions* from those they had receiv'd from their former *Jewish Education*, which were *then* the same with those other *Jews*, as high for the *Constitution* of the *old Peculium*, and as much *prejudged* against the *Change* which was afterwards introduc'd by the *Revelations* of the *Gospel*. Yet less credible it is, that our *Blessed Lord* should have given a *Precedent* of any thing *inconsistent* with the *Duty* of every native *Jew* to the *publick Solemnities* of the *Jewish Nation*; as *countenancing* any *opposite Solemnities* would certainly have been *judg'd*, and very *reasonably*. He own'd that it became him to *fulfil all Righteousness*. He therefore submitted to some *Duties* obliging the *Generality* of such as he *appear'd* to be, (the *reason* of which could not, in *Equity*, have reach'd him, if the *singularity* of his *Case* had

had been known) as in the Case of his *Circumcision*, and his *paying* the publick *Temple Tax*, purposely to cut off all *Pretences*, even from his *Enemies*, of charging him with any uncontested *Violation* of the publick *Laws* relating to *Religion*. He sent his cured *Leaper* to the *Priests*, who by the *Law* were made the *Judges* of *cleansed Leapers*, for a *Testimony* to them; that even *they* might be his *Witnesses* of his punctual Deference to the *Sacerdotal Authority*. He oblig'd his *Disciples* to a strict Observance of what even the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* should determine in *Moses's* Seat, what Liberty soever he took in inveighing against their *Personal Crimes*, and their *Personal Opinions*, which did not concern the *Ecclesiastical Government* of that *old Peculium*. He was oblig'd to do so, if, by his *active Obedience* to the *Law*, he was to obtain that *Righteousness* which might make *them* righteous (even in the sense of the *Law* it self) to whom it should be *imputed*. And it appears he did so, when even his *Enemies* had nothing of that kind to charge him with, how much soever they were concern'd to have insisted on it, if

their *Cause* would have afforded it. But they could find *nothing* of this kind to *accuse* him of, when they were bent upon having his *Life*. And what they had formerly objected in relation to the *Sabbath*, himself had answer'd so satisfactorily, in relation to the true *meaning* of the *Divine Legislator*, that even *themselves* were then ashamed further to insist on it. Yet more incredible it is, that St. *John the Baptist* should have *failed* in his *Duty* of *stated Communion* with the publick *sacred Offices* of his *Nation*. The *Law* is then acknowledg'd to have been in its full *force* 'till *his time*: And *he* could not (like our *Saviour*) pretend the Power of a *Legislator* for *dispensing* in his *own Case* with his *own Laws*. Nor could the *Jews* themselves have been so *destitute* of a Charge against him, as they were when our blessed Lord *provok'd* them to it. Nor were his *preaching* or *praying* confin'd to the *Temple* by the Discipline of the *Law*, in the Opinions of them who were by the *Jews* allow'd for the *Authentick Interpreters* of it.

VII.
St. Paul
acted con-
sonantly to

Thus far therefore within the *Histo-
ry* of the *Acts*, nothing can be pre-
tended

tended why the *Jewish Christians* might not have kept their *stated Communion* with the *Temple-worship*, as well as any other *native Jews*: Nor indeed any thing that might hinder them from *owning* their own *Obligation* to keep it as exactly as others of the same *Nation*. Our Adversaries are themselves mistaken in the Instances by which they pretend to prove it. They were not confin'd so as to have no other *Assemblies* for *Religious Offices* but in the *Temple*, if they did not *sacrifice* in them; if they did not offer any *Sacrifices* in them, that were (by the *Law* it self) *confin'd* to the *Temple*; if they did not *communicate* in any *Sacrifices* *incapable* of the *Temple Communion*, such as were those of the *Heathens* and *Samaritans*. So long as they *abstained* from *these*, their appearing at the *Temple* at the *Three Solemnities*, when they were not hinder'd by such *Excuses* as were allow'd by the *Authoriz'd Interpreters* of the *Law*, was sufficient for the *stated Communion* requir'd from Ordinary Persons: From *Women*, even this was not requir'd. Our Adversaries are again mistaken, when they fancy that *St. Paul's* *circumcising Timothy*, and *refusing* to cir-

the Rules
of constant
Communion with
the *Temple*, both in
circumcising *St. Timothy*, and
in refusing
to circumcise *Titus*.

cumcise *Titus*, had any thing that was *occasional* by the *Principles* of *St. Paul*. Both Cases were such as he thought himself *obliged* to *universally*, in Instances of the *like* nature. His *circumcising St. Timothy* shews how punctual an Observer he was of the *Law* of *Circumcision*, when he took the *least* Occasion for *circumcising* him that could be deriv'd from a *Parent*, circumcising him for the sake of his believing *Jewish Mother*, who was her *self* uncapable of *Circumcision*. Yet, by the *Jewish* Casuistry then receiv'd, she was judg'd to *sanctifie* her unbelieving *Husband*, so far as to intitle their common *Children* to *Circumcision*, that were capable of it. So far they were then from *St. Hierome's* Doctrine, which has generally influenced the later *Schools*, that the *Obligation* to *Circumcision* ceased at our Saviour's *Crucifixion*. So far were they from that, that they did not (as *St. Hierome* did) believe it *mortiferous*, even after the *Destruction* of *Jerusalem*. *St. Justin* Martyr, a far surer *Witness* of *Apostolical* Doctrine, did not (even in *his* Time) disallow it in *Jews* by *Nation*, if they would not therefore *forbear* the *Communion* of *uncircumcised* *Gentile* *Prose-lytes*.

lytes. This therefore was the Design of St. Paul in *refusing* to circumcise *Titus*, thereby to *restrain* the *Jews* from imposing Circumcision on those *Christian Profelytes* who were of *Gentile*, not *Jewish*, Extraction, for whom it was never *designed* by God himself on any other *Condition*, than if they desired to be incorporated into the *Jewish Nation*. This was a Thing indeed desirable, whilst the *Peculium* was *appropriated* to that *Nation*: Not so, when the *new Revelations* of the *Gospel* had made the *Gentiles* capable of being admitted immediately into the *Peculium*, without any such *Condition* of being *incorporated* into another *Nation*. This is the Reason given by St. Paul why he would not circumcise *Titus*, that *Titus* was a *Ἕλλη*, Gal. ii. 3. as that Word includes *all* other *Nations* that were not *Jews*. Meaning, no doubt, that he was so by *both* Parents, that he had not so much as a *Jewish Mother*, which made his Case different from that of St. Timothy. And in asserting this *Freedom* of *Gentile* Converts from *Circumcision*, according to the *Revelation* given to St. Peter in the Case of *Cornelius*, and his *own Mission* to the *uncircumcis'd*

Gentiles, he was always very *resolute* and *constant* to *himself*, and more open in *asserting* it than even the other *Apostles*. He would not give way to the *Imposers* of it on the *Gentiles*, no not for an *Hour*, Gal. ii. 5. But blames his Fellow-Apostle St. *Barnabas*, and even St. *Peter* himself, for *dissembling* their own *Thoughts* for fear of *offending* the *Convert Jews*, v. 11. 13. Here was therefore nothing *occasional*, but what was the effect of his avowed *Principles*, neither to *exclude* any *Convert Jew* from *Circumcision*, nor to *admit* any *Convert Gentile* to it. How can therefore this be any *Precedent* for *occasional Communion*, which was true to *Principles*, and as *universally* regular in both Cases as the *Parity* of the *Case* occurred for *Practice*? They are yet further mistaken, if they think all *separate Assemblies* inconsistent with the publick *stated Communion*. The *Jews* did not think them so *then*, nor should we think the like so *now*, if they were not in *Assemblies* of *separate Communions* in the sense now explain'd. The *Jews* then had their *lesser subordinate Bodies*, and those for *Religion* also, who were so far from *dividing* from the
Pub-

Publick, that indeed none could profess his *Union* in the *Peculium* at a distance, but by his *joining* in those *Assemblies* which were known to consist of *Members* who had an acknowledged *Right* of being admitted to the *publick Sacrifices*.

Their very *Heresies* were not reckoned as *divided* from the *Temple-worship* on that bare *general* account of their being *Heresies*, unless they taught some particular *dividing* Doctrine, that was *inconsistent* with their *Communion* with the *Temple Sacrifices*. The *Galileans* were the greatest *Zealots* of all for the *Temple Sacrifices*, who would not endure that any *Sacrifices* should be offer'd for the *Heathen Princes*, who had the *Dominion* of their *Nation*. The *Pharisees* are, by our Lord himself, acknowledg'd to sit in *Moses's Seat*. And the *Sadducees* are commonly join'd with them, both in the *Sacred Writers* and *Josephus*, as having a Share with them in the *Sanhedrin* itself. *Ananus*, though a *Sadducee*, was in the *highest* Office of the *Temple-worship*, that of a *High-Priesthood*. This Advantage *St. Paul* took to *divide* the Counsels of that greatest *Judicatory* of their *Nation* in his own Case.

The

VIII.
The Christians, as a reputed Heresy, were not therefore a distinct Communion from the Temple.

IX.
The Case
of the Ef-
senes how
reconcila-
ble with
the Com-
munion of
the Tem-
ple. As
also that of
St. James
the chief
Apostle.

Joseph.
Ant. xviii.
2.

The *Essenes* are the only *Hereticks* that are suspicious of being *divided* from the *Temple Sacrifices* by what *Josephus* reports of them. Yet I cannot therefore think that they were *cut off* from the *Communion* with the *Temple*, at least not by any *publick Censure* of those who had the *Power* of the *Temple-worship*. Had they been so, *Josephus* and *Philo*, who were for the *Temple*, could not have been so liberal, as we find them, in their *Commendations*. *Josephus* himself owns their sending ἀναθήματα to the *Temple*, which was an *owning* of the *Temple-worship*, and a *Claim* of their own *Title* to it, which would not have been *receiv'd* by the *Temple-Priests*, if the *Persons* that sent them had been under any *publick Censure*, as having *no Right* to *partake* in the *publick Offices*. So *Nehemiah* did with the *Offerings* of *Tobiah* the *Ammonite*, xiii. 8, 9. though nearly *related* to the *Peculium*. What then can *Josephus* mean by the following Words in their *Case*? Δυσίας ἐκ ἐπιτελῶσι διαφορῆτι ἀγνείων ἃς νομίζοιεν, καὶ δι' αὐτὸ ἐργόμηναι τῷ κοινῷ τελεμνίσματι, ἐφ' αὐτῶν τὰς Δυσίας ἐπιτελῶσι. So he in his *Antiquities*. In his *Jewish War* he

he has nothing concerning their Sentiments relating to the *Temple-worship*; yet here he mentions their offering no *Sacrifices* there, nay their being *excluded* from it, and being thereby obliged to offer *such Sacrifices* as they conversed in, ἐπ' αὐτῶν, in the Places of their own retired Residence. Had these *Sacrifices* been of that kind as were, by the *Law*, confined to the *Place* of their *publick Solemnities*, this had alone been sufficient to *cut* them off from the *Communion* of the *Temple*; but I cannot easily believe that they were so. *Philo* assures us they were against *bloody Sacrifices*, which is very agreeable to their other Characters, most of which are derived from the *Pythagoreans*, as those of the *Sadducees* were from the *Epicureans*, and of the *Pharisees* from the *Stoicks*. The *Pythagoreans* were also against *bloody Sacrifices*, and the *Essenes* are produced as Patrons of the *same Practice* by *Porphyry*, in his excellent Work *de Abſtinentiâ* professedly on that Subject. This being so, it will follow that the *Sacrifices* offered in the Places of their *Retirement* could not be of the *bloody* kind. Had they been only those *mystical Sacrifices* of *Praise* and *Thanksgiving*,

giving, those had been as performable in the *Temple* it self as any where, and therefore could have put them under no pretence of offering them *separately*. I therefore rather incline to believe that these *Sacrifices* were such as I have elsewhere shewn were offer'd by others who *abhorred* the bloody ones, of *baked Effigies* of *animals* made of *Dough*. These were different from the *Meat-Offerings* appointed by the *Law*, and therefore might very reasonably be *refused* by those who were to take care of the *Temple-worship*, that it might be performed according to the true *Design* of the *Law-maker*. And being so *refused*, they had no *other* Place so proper for offering this kind of Oblations as their *συνεῖα*, the *holiest Places*, in their *opinion*, next the *Temple*, and indeed the most becoming Places for things *proper* to their own *Sect*. Such were these *Sacrifices*, which were neither *prescribed* by the *Law* of *Moses*, nor *allow'd* or *practiced* by any of the other *Heresies* then *receiv'd* among the *Communicants* in the *Temple-worship*. There were therefore Two Things that might make the *Communion* of this *Sect* in the *Publick Solemnities* justly *questionable*. One was, that those *Sacrifices*

crifices of the *dough Animals* were plainly *peculiar* to this *Heresy* alone, so that they could not, by receiving them, pretend to receive any thing *common* to the whole *Peculium*. Another was, that their Aversion to *bloody Sacrifices* made it impossible for the *Essenes* to *communicate* in the *bloody Sacrifices* appointed by God *himself* for the *Communion* of the whole *Nation*. Yet both of these were to be judg'd by the authoriz'd *Interpreters* of the *Law*, who were, in all likelihood, *favourable* to the *Sect* I am speaking of. The *Sacrifices* of the *συνείκια* were indeed distributed only among *Communicants* of the *Essenes* themselves; but the original *Consecration* of the *Corn* and *Dough* of which these *Sacrifices* consisted (without which *Consecration* they could not have been fit for *confederating* a *Holy Body*) depended on the *Consecration* they had receiv'd from the *First-Fruits* of the *Corn*, and the *Meat-Offering*, and the *Shew-Loaves*, offered in the *Temple*. Nor might it seem necessary that the publick *Priesthood* of the *Nation* shou'd be concern'd in a *Communion* confined only to a *subordinate Sect*, any more than had been always usual in *Circum-*
cision,

cision, and such like *Sacrificial Solemnities of private Families*. Nor was it necessary that their *not* participating in the publick *bloody Sacrifices* should necessarily cut them off from the *National Communion*. *Porphyry*, in the Name of the *Pythagoreans*, pretends to shew at large that the *unbloody Sacrifices of First-Fruits of the Earth* were the most *ancient* and most *acceptable* to God, and that the *bloody ones* were much *later* and *less acceptable*. He pretends to mark out the *Original* of the *bloody ones*, at least among the *Greeks*. As for the *Antiquity*, I know not what can be said to the undoubtedly *acceptable Sacrifice of Abel*. However very celebrated Authors of that Age ascrib'd more to the *Manners* of the *Sacrificers*, than to the *Costliness* of the *bloody Sacrifices*. Many of them carry'd this so far, as to supersede the *Dependance* of such *Holy Souls* on *Temples* themselves, and all *external Offices* of any whatsoever *Religion*. They believed *pure Bodies* to be *Temples* more *acceptable* to God than any *Temples* made with *Hands*, and more certainly *inhabited* by him, and by the *Divine Archetypal High-Priest*. They believed such Persons to need no other *Temples*,

ples, nor other *Priest*, as being admitted to a more *immediate* Access to God himself, than could be expected by any *Temple* or *external Priest* of less holy *Morals*. This was the Hypothesis of *Plotinus*, and *Porphry*, and *Hierocles*, and several others of the *Pythagoreans*: And therefore *Porphry's* Epistle to *Anebo* destroys all Dependence on the *Externals* of the *Heathen*, as well as of the *Jewish* and the *Christian* Solemnities. This therefore is an *Extreme* not to be regarded; but it might very well consist with the Principles of the *Essenes*, if, at least, they *communicated* with the consecrated Oblations of the *Species* and of the *Meat-Offerings*, though they could not with the *bloody Sacrifices*. That very *Communion* was, in the Opinion of the most celebrated Authors, sufficient to intitle them to the *Body* and *Privileges* of the *Peculium*, and was agreeable to the διαφορῆς ἁγνείων, the more than ordinary *Purifications* which had gain'd the Applause of those who were not of their Mind, and which *Josephus* observes as the *Reason* why they did not *communicate* in those *Sacrifices* that were *bloody*: For *Purity* of the *Mind* was, by the *Casuits* of the

the sublimest Philosophy of those Ages thought sufficient to impetrate a *Lit-ation* with *Frankincense* and the *mola salsa*, *farre* & *salicata micâ*, and the like *Oblations* of the least Expence. There are many, even *Heathen*, Testimonies to this purpose, to which the present Occasion will hardly allow me to digress. *Hierocles* on the *Golden Verses* quotes an *Oracle* for it, which with them was a *Divine* Testimony. *Philo* has many things to the same purpose, by whom we may know the Sense of the *Jews* themselves in the *Apostolical* Age. He tells us, Ὅτις ἀναλλή-
 ες, καὶ μὴδὲν θύωσι τοῦ ὁσίου πάν, ἀποδέ-
 χεσθαι· βωμοῖς γὰρ ἀπύροισ περὶ ὧς ἀρεταὶ
 χορεύουσιν, γένηται ὁ θεός. Elsewhere,
 Χαίρει φιλοθέοις γνώμαις καὶ ἀνδραγαθίᾳ ἀσ-
 κηταῖς ὁσιότητι παρ' ὧν ψαυσὰ καὶ κοινὰς
 καὶ τὰ ὑπερέσβια ὡς τιμιώτατα, πρὸ τῶν
 πολυτελεσάτων ἁσμεν δέχεται. Καὶ
 μέγιστοι μὴδὲν ἕτερον κομίζουσιν, αὐτὰς φέ-
 ροντες πλῆρωμα καλοκαγαθίας τελειότα-
 τον, τὴν ἀρετὴν ἀνάγκη δύσιν ὕμνοις τὸν
 ἀεργέτιον καὶ σωτῆρα γεραίροντες. And,
 for Proof of his Opinion, he observes,
 that the Altar of *Incense*, which had
 nothing to do with the *bloody Sacrifi-*
ces, was more valuable in God's Sight,
 and by him design'd for the *purest* Per-
 sons:

De plant.
Noc.p.229

De victim.
offerentib.
p. 849.

sons : Χρυσὸν μὲν κατεσκόδασαι, ἰδρυταί P. 850.
 δ' ἐν αὐτῷ εἶσω τῷ προτέρῳ καταπετάσ-
 ματῶ, ὅς ἐδενὶ τῷ ἄλλων ἐστὶν ὁρατός,
 ὅτι μὴ τοῖς ἀγνώστοι τῷ ἱερέων, καὶ γέγονε
 πρὸς χρείαν τῷ θυμιαμάτων. Thence
 he infers; Ἐξ ἧ δὴλόν ἐστιν ὅτι καὶ βρα-
 χύτατον λιβανωτὸν παρ' ἀνδρὸς ὁσὶς τιμω-
 τερον ὁ θεὸς νομίζει μυρίων θυμιαμάτων,
 ὅσα ἂν τις ἱερουργῇ μὴ σφόδρα ἀσείῳ ὦν.
 Ὅσα γὰρ διμαί λίδων μὲν ἀμείνων χρύ-
 σῳ, τὰ δ' ἐν αὐτοῖς τῷ ἐκεῖ ἀγνώτερον,
 τοσούτῳ κρεῖττον ἢ διὰ τῷ ἐπιθυμωμένων
 ὀχλαρυσία τῆς διὰ τῷ ἐναίμων. Here we
 see the Reasons, that these Notions are
 agreeable to the Mind of God himself,
 by Reasonings then, no doubt, allow-
 ed by those who were accounted the
 Authentick Judges of Matters of this
 Nature. And indeed such Reasonings
 seem to have been allowed by God him-
 self, in those Places of the Old Testa-
 ment it self, where he seems to under-
 value bloody Sacrifices, and so to pre-
 fer the Manners of the Sacrificers be-
 fore them, as to accept of those pure
 and holy Dispositions of Mind instead
 of them. So in Psalm LI. and in the
 famous Passage of Micah. In truth,
 the bloody Sacrifices seem principally
 design'd to atone for Legal Transgres-
 sion, for the Reason given by the A-
 postle, no doubt, according to the

Sense of the Scribes and Teachers of the *Law* in that Age, that *without shedding Blood there could be no Remission*. That being so, there could not be that *need* of them to those who were not guilty of those *Legal Trespasses* for which those *Legal Attonements* had been appointed. I know *Philo* is, by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, call'd a *Pythagorean*; yet certainly not so as might make him also *uncapable* of *Communion* with the *Temple Sacrifices*, which all his Writings shew him to have approved of. If therefore he has delivered nothing in this Matter *inconsistent* with the Doctrine of the Doctors of the *Temple*, it will then appear that even these Notions of the *Essene* *Ἐσσηνοὶ* did not necessarily *exclude* them from *constant Communion* with the *Temple*, as far as they were thought in Duty *obliged* to it. Their *Purity* excus'd them both from the *Reason* and the *Cost* of *bloody Sacrifices*, and made their *Incense* and *Immolations* as valuable in God's sight as the *bloody Sacrifices*, which were more *expensive*. And as the *Priests* themselves were not allow'd an Access to this more *inward* and more *holy Altar*, which was within the *περίτερον καταπέτασμα*, oppos'd to the *δύτερον καταπέτασμα*, *Ebr. ix. 3.* so with the
like,

like, or perhaps more severe, ἀγνεία as that was of the *Priests*, the *Essenes* might have been allowed, if not *Access*, at least *Communion*, with the *Sacerdotal Office* there perform'd. This, by the way, gives a very easie and intelligible Account of what *Hegesippus* reports concerning *St. James*, our Lord's Brother, the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, which is thought so incredible by the great *Scaliger*. That Author's Words are, Τέτρῳ μόνῳ ἐξῆλθῶ εἰς τὰ ἅγια εἰσιέναι. *Petavius* has already observed, that the Place where he is said to have enter'd is not called the ἅγια τῶ ἁγίου, as *Scaliger* understood it, but only τὰ ἅγια. He has withal shewn that the Two Names are however confounded by Authors, who usually take one for the other. But by this Passage of *Philo* it plainly appears, that Two Partitions of the *Temple* were contain'd under the general Name of ἁδύτων, as well that between the Two *Veils* which was common to their *High-Priest* with the common *Priests* of the ἐκκλησία, when they were dispos'd for it by their preparatory ἀγνεία, as that which began from the *Second Veil*, and reach'd from thence to the *Mercy Seat*, into which the *High-Priests* alone were al-

Ap. Euseb.
H.E. 11. 23.

lowed to enter only once a Year on the great Day of *Propitiation*. And not without Reason, because that whole Space was *inaccessible* by the *People*. Yet so the *Holy of Holies* it self had a peculiar Right to the Title of *Ἄδυστον*, being *inaccessible* even to the *Priests* themselves, excepting the *High-Priest*, and and to him only *accessible* on that *One* great *Festival*. St. James therefore, according to *Hegesippus's* Character of him, seems to have been the same way qualify'd for *immediate* Participation at the *inward* most holy *Golden Altar*, as the *Essenes*, or even the *Priests* themselves. He is said to have been *holy* from his *Mother's Womb*: And that *Holiness* is describ'd in the very same Observances which made the *Essenes*, and the *Priests* themselves, to be esteem'd so *extraordinarily holy*. His never having drunk *Wine* nor *Sider* (*strong Drink*, as we translate it) was that which was exacted from *Samson's* Mother, much more from *himself*, that he might be *holy* from his *Mother's Womb*. It was also observ'd by the *Essenes* and the *Priests*, if not from their *Mother's Womb*, at least at the Time of their *Sacrifices*. The *Shew Bread* which was taken from that
Golden

Ap. Euseb.
H.E. 11.23.

Golden Altar was proper only to be eaten by *Priests*; yet it was not denied to Persons of *Priestly Holiness*, tho' inferior to that of the *Essenes* and *St. James*, as appears in the Case of *David*: But that was when its *Staleness* had almost taken away its *Consecration*. His *Abstinence* from *living Creatures* was exactly *Essene*, as the *Essenes* were *Pythagoreans*, and intitled him, as much as it did them, to this most *holy Communion*. The *Rasor* not coming on his *Head* was exactly *Nazarene* in the Case of *Samson*, and agreeable to the *ἀνχμὸς* so remarkable in the Character of the *Essenes*. Of the same kind also was his Neglect of *Oyntment* and *Baths*, agreeable to the Simplicity of those holy *Essenes*, and their Averseness even to innocent *Pleasures*. His wearing *Linnen* was also a Habit of *Holiness*, and usual, in *holy Offices*, not only for *Priests*, but others also in the *Time* of performing them. Thence the *Linnen Ephod* of *Samuel* when devoted by his Mother to the Service of God, and of *David* when he danced before the *Ark*. It was observed also by the *Priests* of *Isis*, as well as by the *Essenes* we are speaking of. But the constant wearing

of that Habit, and *constantly* qualifying themselves to do so, as practised by the *Essenes*, and *St. James*, was really *more* than was exacted by the strictest *sacerdotal Discipline* of the *holiest Priesthood* of all, even that of the *High-Priesthood* it self: And therefore it might well intitle them to an Access to the *holiest Places*, and as *Communicants* to the *holiest Offices*, so long as they did not transgress the Station of *Communicants*, and did not presume to exercise any *Act* of the *Sacerdotal Function*. On these Terms therefore *St. James*, as well as the *Essenes*, might *continue* in the *Communion* of the *Temple*, tho' he who abstain'd from *Animals*, could, no more than *they*, partake of the *bloody Sacrifices*. Particularly *St. James's* good Correspondence with the *Temple* appears in the *Advice* given by him to *St. Paul* for avoiding the *Scandal* of the *Zea-*
lots for the *Temple*. The Paschal Lamb was the *bloody Sacrifice* that most universally oblig'd; yet it does not appear that every *Individual* was, even by *God* himself, *obliged* to eat of it. *Uncircumcised Persons* were *excluded* from it, and *no* circumcised Person *could* be *excluded* if he insisted on his *Right* of
being

being admitted to it. He was also to be punished with the Punishment of *Excision*, if he *polluted* himself with eating *leavened Bread*: But for his *not* eating the *Paschal Lamb* we find no *Punishment* denounc'd, provided he comply'd with the *other Rites* of the *Paschal Solemnity*, of partaking in the *unleavened Bread* and *bitter Herbs*. It was not usual, even in *common Entertainments*, to *oblige* every individual *Guest* to eat of *every Dish* that was prepared for him.

Thus it appears what *Liberty* was allow'd for the *distinct Government* of *subordinate Societies*, even in the *Peculium* it self, *consistently* with their *Communion* in common with the *old Peculium*. *Heresy* was then *no Obstruction* to it, when the *Sadducees* were so notoriously allow'd a Share even in the *Government* of it; when the *Essenes*, who did not approve of *bloody Sacrifices* themselves, were yet allowed in the *Communion*, whilst they did not *condemn* the *Communion* of those who did communicate in *bloody Sacrifices*, though they thought their own Institution more *pure* without them. The *Christians* also are called a *Heresy* by the *Jews*, *Acts xxiv. 14.*

X.
The Breach
of Com-
munion be-
tween the
Jews and
the Christi-
ans was
made by the
Sanhedrin,
a little be-
fore the De-
struction
of their
Temple.

Of the *Heresy* of the *Nazarenes*, v. 5. Yet this can be no more *inconsistent* with their being in *Communion* with the *Temple*, than it had been to have been of any *other Heresy* that notoriously *communicated* with it. The *Christians* might, notwithstanding *this*, have had their own *Meetings*, their own *Teachers*, their own *Governors*, and therefore their own *by-Laws*, for the Management of their own *private Bodies*, as well as the other *Heresies*. This therefore did not make the *Breach*, nor indeed were the *Christians* the *immediate* Causes of it, but the *Jews* themselves first, by alienating their *Synagogues*, by *provoking* the *Apostles* to a Sentence against them, by shaking off the *Dust* of their *Shoes* against them, according to the Prescription of our Lord himself. This *Provocation*, when it grew *general*, occasion'd the *general Excision* mention'd by the *Apostle* to the *Romans*, in the Year 54. before the *End* of the History of the *Acts* of the *Apostles*. But it could not conclude the *Sanhedrin*, which had alone the Power of the *Temple-worship*. The Division from the *Temple-worship* seems to have been made by the *Sanhedrin* it self, which had a Power of *concluding*

cluding all the *Jewish Synagogues* in what Part soever of the then known *World*. That *they* did interpose their Authority, we understand from St. *Justine* Martyr. He upbraids *Tryphon* with the Bigottry of his Nation against the *Christians*, that they sent from *Jerusalem* ἀνδρες ἐκλεκτοί, answering the ἀνδρες ἐκλεκτοί, *Acts* xv. 22, 25. sent by the *Christian Jerusalem* Authority to the *Christian Colonies*, no doubt by the *Example* of the *Jewish Sanhedrin*. Indeed these *chosen* Men being sent from *Jerusalem* εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, that is, where-ever there were *Jewish Colonies*, could not receive their Authority from *any* but the *supreme Sanhedrin*. By these Messengers they pretended to give Warning of the *Atheistical Heresy* of the *Christians*, which they also call ἀνομον, and charge them with ἄθεα, and ἀνομα, and ἀνόσια. These Charges are alluded to in the Writings of the New Testament, particularly in the Writings of St. *Paul* and St. *James*. The Ground of the Charge may easily be judg'd to be, that the *Jewish Christians* communicated in *Holy Offices* with *uncircumcis'd Gentile Converts*. This they took for ἀνομον and ἁνοσιον, and for an Affront to the true

Dialog.
cum Try-
phon, p.
234, 335.

true God, which gave them occasion to charge the *Christians* with *Atheism*, it being otherwise withal very notorious how little the *Christians* esteem'd any of the other then-receiv'd Gods. This very Act of *Communion*, and much more the justifying it by *Principles*, involv'd them also in the *Guilt*, and therefore divided them from the God so affronted by them, in the Opinion of those who believ'd it an *Affront*. They must therefore also believe themselves oblig'd to abstain from their *Communion*, for fear of the like Contagion; for if the *Jewish Christians* communicating with the *uncircumcis'd*, (who for that reason could not be reckon'd *ἐνομοι*, but *ἀνομοι*) made themselves *ἀνόμοι* by doing so; it must also follow, that the *Jews* who were subject to the *Sanhedrin* must involve themselves in the like Contagion of *ἀνομία*, by allowing any sacred Commerce with those *Christian Jews*, who, by their communicating with *uncircumcis'd Gentiles*, were, by themselves, judg'd to have disown'd their own subjection to the Law of the *Peculium*, and therefore to have forfeited their Right to the Privileges of it; for they who by *Communion* with the
Gen-

Gentiles had made themselves *ἀνόμους*, like the *Gentiles*, could thenceforward, by this *Reasoning*, have no more claim to the *Sacrifices* of that *Peculium* than the *Gentiles* themselves. This *Sentence* therefore, as soon as it was universally receiv'd by the *Body* of the *Unbelieving Jews*, (as we have little reason to doubt but that it was, upon this *Publication* of it mention'd by St. *Justine* Martyr) must immediately have ended in a *Breach* of *Communion* with the *Christians*. As to the *Time* when this *Defamation* of the *Christians* was *promulged* by the foremention'd Messages of the *Sanhedrin*, St. *Justin* gives us Two Notes; one is, that it was, ἐπειδὴ ἐγνώκατε αὐτὸν ἀναβάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ ἀναβάντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ὡς αἱ προφητεῖαι προεμύνησαν Χριστόμελλον. This (if it related to the time immediately following our blessed Lord's *Resurrection* and *Ascension*) might incline us to suspect that it gave occasion to the *Martyrdom* of St. *Stephen*, and that St. *Paul* himself was one of those chosen Men authoriz'd by the *High-Priest* and *Sanhedrin* for the *Persecution* of the *Damascene Christians*. But whatever *Anger* the *Sanhedrin* might, even then, have conceiv'd against

gainst the *Christians*, as charging them with the *Murder* of our *Saviour*, *Acts* ii. 23, 36. iii. 13, 14, 15. iv. 10. v. 28, 30. vii. 52. Nay, tho' the Accusers of St. *Stephen* charg'd him with having spoken *blasphemous things against the Temple and the Law*, v. 13. just as they had charg'd our Lord himself with *destroying the Temple*, and violating the *Sabbath*, though even the same Accusers carry'd their Charge so high as to pretend they had heard St. *Stephen* say, that *Jesus* of *Nazareth* should *change the Customs that Moses had deliver'd to them*, v. 14. as being the most *provoking* Point for exasperating the Rage of the *Zealots*; yet they had not so much *Appearance* for this last Charge, as to gain Credit with their partial *Judges* concerning it. After this the Churches had *Rest* in *Judæa*, and *Samaria*, and *Galilee*, *Acts* ix. 31. the Places most liable to *Jewish* Tumults. And again, not receiv'd only, but *invited* also, to *speak* in their *Synagogue*, *Acts* xiii. 15. which could not have been if they had then been under any *publick* general *Censure* of the *Sanhedrin*. Indeed how could they whilst the *greatest*, even of the *Apostles* themselves, were as
zealous

zealous in the Case of *Cornelius* for the present State, and as much prejudg'd the Change that was after really made by *later Revelations*, as many of the *Rabbins*? However the same *St. Justine* elsewhere shews, that this Breach was made *before* the *Destruction* of their *Temple*; for he adds it as P. 335. a farther Aggravation of their Guilt, that *after* the *Destruction* of their *City*, and the *Desolation* of their *Land*, *πρὸς τέτοις*, they still persisted in those *Execrations* of the *Christians* they had formerly begun by their foremention'd *chosen Missionaries*. I am apt to think that this was the true time of it, that as this Breach was *before* the *Destruction* of the *Temple*, so it could not have been *long* before it, yet *after* the *End* of the *History* of the *Acts* of the *Apostles*, and *St. Paul's* first Imprisonment in *Rome*.

This Breach must have been *before* the *Destruction* of the *Temple*; from that time forward, to the time of *St. Justine*, we never find the *Sanhedrin* at *Jerusalem* in a Condition to send the *Missionaries* or *Encyclical Epistles* mention'd by him. *Titus* left nothing but *Desolation* behind him. *Epiphanius* mentions some *Cottages* built there,

II.
This was
made by
the Sanhe-
drin be-
tween the
Year LXIII
and LXVI.

there, not by *Jews*, but by the *Christians* return'd from *Pella*. And from the building of *Hadrian's Ælia Capitolina*, none but *Gentiles* by *Extraction* were permitted to live there. Even in *Barcochba's* Rebellion, though he was a severe *Persecutor* of the *Christians*, yet we find no Footsteps of any Exercise of *Jewish* Authority at *Jerusalem*. None certainly that could send out *Emissaries* into all Countries of the *Jewish* Dispersion, that could be meant by St. *Justine* Martyr. The *Roman* Tax on their *Circumcision* for the *Temple* of *Peace*, and their own *Mutinousness* for this whole space, kept the *Jews* themselves very low, and disabled them for any Attempt of this nature. This Persecution therefore must have been before the *Ruin* of the *Temple*. I add further, that this sending their dividing *Missionaries* against the *Christians*, ἐς πᾶσαν γῆν, must needs have been in a time of *Peace*, and therefore could not be later than the Twelfth Year of *Nero*, and the Seventeenth of the younger King *Agrippa*, (mention'd under that Name in the *Acts*) who began his Account not from the *Death* of his *Father*, the elder King *Agrippa*,
(whom

(whom St. *Luke* calls *Herod*) but from the *Death* of his *Uncle Herod*, King of *Chalcis*, in the Year *XLIX*. and therefore fixes the Year *LXVI*. for the *Beginning* of the fatal *War*; from that time forward the *Jews* were diverted by Affairs of nearer Concernment to themselves, from regarding the *Christians*. And how much soever their *Rage* might have transported them, yet they could not have sent their *Incendiaries* into all their *Colonies* of the *Dispersion*, as well within as without the *Roman Empire*, when they had begun their *Hostilities* against the *Romans*. Nor, if they could have sent them, could they have expected the *Compliance* of their Brethren in their *Enemy's* Dominions, that was requisite for their purpose To have attempted it then, would but have hazarded their chosen Friends, and have recommended the *Christians* to the *Protection* of the *Roman Empire*, and all without the least prospect of probable Success, that might seem to make amends for so great and obvious Mischiefs to their principal Design. They had the like *Diversions* under the Tyrannical Governments of *Florus* and *Albinus*, sufficient to
turn

turn their Care from the *Christians* to themselves. It was in the Beginning of *Albinus*, but before his Entrance into the Province, that *Ananias* ventur'd on the *Martyrdom* of St. *James* the *Just*, the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, and Brother of our *Lord*. But he had a threatening Letter for it from *Albinus*, and was immediately turn'd out of his *Pontificate* by King *Agrippa*, which disabled him, and, no doubt, restrain'd his Successor from any Attempt of the like nature after the Arrival of *Albinus*. This was about the Year *LXIII*. as we may gather from the time of *Jesus*, the Denouncer of *Woe* against *Jerusalem*, who began his Prognostication Four Years before the beginning of the War, Seven Years before the Destruction of the *Temple*, and yet in the Præfectship of *Albinus*. *Josephus* makes the Crime charg'd against St. *James* to have been *παρὰνομία*, which *Hegesippus* shews to have been his good Testimony concerning our Saviour. It hence appears, that the *Prophecy* concerning our *Lord* was then fulfill'd, ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη, *Isa.* liii. 12. Not only as ἀνομία signify'd a Malefactor in general, but as it also denoted that particular

ticular *Capital Crime* of a *Defection* from the *Mosaic Law* of the *old Peculium*. That must have been the Case in this Instance of *St. James*, who had no *other* Prevarication of the *Law* objected to him, besides that *general* one of his *owning* our *Saviour*. His *Communicating* in *sacred Offices* with the *uncircumcis'd Gentiles* might very probably have been included, which was also a Charge that concern'd him on the *general Account* of his being a *Christian*. This seems to suppose that *general* Condemnation of the *Christians* past, which made them all *ἀνόμους*, as I have already observ'd from *St. Justine*. This might very probably have been the *occasion* that *disposed* the *Jerusalem Christians* to remove to *Pella*. They had indeed a *Divine Revelation* to do so, as both *Eusebius* and *Epiphanius* assure us. But that they should leave *Jerusalem* at that very *time* of the *Passover*, which brought so great a *Concourse* to it of the *Jews* that did not believe, must needs show the greater *Indifferency* of the *Jewish Christians* for the *Law* of the *Passover* it self, which might very well be when their being on the *Place* at that *Holy Season* would expose them to the

Rage of the Zealots, as well as of those *lawful Powers* which were more *immediately* concern'd in the ordinary *Execution of the Law*. That *Danger* would be more imminent, after they had been *marked out for Destruction* by so notorious an Interposition of the *Legal Authority*. St. James was very *wary* of giving *Offence* to his own *Nation*, as far as it could be avoided with *Consistency* with *Principles*, as appears by his Advice to St. Paul in a like Case of *Scandal* against him. This might very probably keep up his *Authority* with the *Jews* longer than that of any *other* of the *Apostles*, 'till the *Zealots* forc'd him, on this Occasion, to speak his Mind more freely. However, we find Footsteps of the foremention'd *Sentences* of the *Sanhedrin* several Years before his *Martyrdom*. I am very apt to think from the Year LVII. wherein St. Paul was the first time *Prisoner* at *Rome*. The *Roman Jews* then tell him, that they then understood that the *Heresy* (so they call'd it) of the *Christians* was every where *spoken against*, *Acts* xxviii. 22. What can this so probably refer to, as the *general Sentence* denounc'd against the *Christians*

stians by the *chosen Missionaries*, ἐν πᾶσιν τῶν γλῶ, in the Words of St. *Justine* Martyr? I know not but this may fix the very *Year* of it. It is plain that they had a very *imperfect* Account of what had been transacted against the *Christians*, by their desiring a *fuller* Account of it from the Apostle himself. Nor seem they to have had any *Suspicion* that *Authority* had concern'd it self in the Dispute. That would have made them more reserv'd in *receiving* their *Information* from a Person so eminently interested in it, from a *Ringleader of the new Sect*, *Acts* xxiv. 5. in the stile of his Accusers. They might indeed have had this Account concerning the *Christians* from their *travelling Brethren* of the *anathematizing Cities* and *Synagogues*, that had *before* this been *cut off* from the *Peculium* by the *Apostles*, by the Ceremony appointed for that purpose by our Saviour, of *casting off* the *Dust* of their *Shoes* for a *Testimony against them*. But these Words, ἐν πᾶσιν τῶν γλῶ, in St. *Justine*, are so exactly parallel to the πανταχῶς in the *Acts*, that the *Publick Censure* of the *Sanhedrin* seems to have been the true Occasion of what the *Roman Jews*

had receiv'd concerning the *Christians*, though they had not yet so *distinct* an Account of the *Fact* as to *know* it was so. The *Communion* of the *Christian Jews* with the *uncircumcis'd Gentile Converts* to the *Christian Religion* was by this time so very *notorious*, as that it could hardly escape the Observation of the *Sanhedrin* it self, how *wary* soever the *Christians* themselves were in *concealing* it from them. The *Caution* they us'd in that matter appears in that which *St. Paul* calls *Disimulation* in *St. Peter* and *St. Barnabas*, when they *withdrew* themselves even from *eating* with the *Gentiles* on the Arrival of the *Brethren* from *St. James*. It hereby appears that even *their Behaviour* to *Gentile Converts* was not *then* commonly known in *Jerusalem* to the *Jewish Christians*, where there were so few *Converts* of *Gentile Extraction* that might give *occasion* to discover it. This made them so *wary* in *concealing* the freedom they took, in *that* particular, before those who might *report* and *attest* it to *them*, who were so ready to take *Scandal* at it, even of those who *profess'd* themselves *Members* of the *new Peculium*, and on the *new Terms*. So
the

the Case stood in the Year XLVIII. after the Decree of the Apostles at Jerusalem against the imposing of Circumcision on the Gentile Converts. The same Caution St. Paul himself us'd after this, when he circumcis'd St. Timothy for his Jewish Mother's sake, because of the Jews that were in those Parts, Acts xvi. 3. Plainly intimating that he did not think Circumcision obliging even to the Jewish Nation, when he would not have circumcis'd him if the Jews had not been ready to take Scandal if he had not circumcis'd him. But this he might comply with, which was sufficiently consistent with the Communion between Jews and uncircumcis'd Gentiles, though he could not in the Case of Titus, which had manifestly tended to the Breach of Communion in sacred Offices, if he had therefore treated Titus as unholy because uncircumcis'd, though he was under no antecedent Obligation to be circumcis'd. He thereby plainly shew'd, that he was not so indifferent, as our Adversaries fancy him, in the matter of Communion, though he was indeed so in reference to Circumcision or Uncircumcision, when no Consequence follow'd that might be hurtful

to *Communion*. After this, for several Years we find the *Jews* very tumultuous in *Asia* the *Leis*, and *Macedonia* and *Greece*; where-ever *St. Paul* appear'd; yet so as that this did not hinder him frequently to bring the *Alms* of his *Nation* to *Jerusalem*, and to appear at their several *annual Festivals*, which could be celebrated nowhere else. This plainly shews that even *St. Paul* himself was under no *publick* Censure of the *Sanhedrin*, which would have made it very *unsafe* for him to have put himself under their *Power*. And the *last* time of his being in *Jerusalem*, that is mention'd in the *Acts* (about the *Year LIV.*) they were the *Jews* of *Asia*, that came to *Jerusalem* occasionally, that rais'd the *Tumult* against him that occasion'd his *first Captivity*; not even the *Jews* of *Jerusalem*. That also shews that this was the *first* *Tumult* that was rais'd concerning him in *Jerusalem*. The reason why these *Tumults* in the *Dispersion* were so long before they reach'd the *Metropolis* of their *Nation*, was because even the *Christian Jews* of *Jerusalem* had, from their *Education*, a great *Favour* for the *Law* under which they had been educated,

cated. This *restrain'd* them from giving any *Offence* to their *unbelieving Fellow-Citizens*, and made the Reports concerning St. *Paul* not so easily *believ'd*, when they found his *Brethren* upon the *Place* as punctual as themselves in the *Observation* of their common *Law*. And this not so much for *fear* of *scandalizing* the *Unbelievers*, as out of their own *Inclination*. They also had a *Love* and *Zeal* for the *Law* as well as the *Unbelievers*, and were apt also to take *Offence*, if any others of their *Brethren* had not the same hearty *Zeal* for it as themselves. They could be no other but *Christians* who came from St. *James*, Gal. ii. 12. Yet it was for *fear* of offending *them* that St. *Peter* and St. *Barnabas* were driven into the *Disimulation*, for which they were reprov'd by St. *Paul*. Nor had the *Jerusalem* believing *Jews* alter'd their *Opinions* in that Particular, when St. *Paul* was advis'd by St. *James* to take on him the *Vow* of a *Nazarite* for satisfying *them*, not the *unbelieving Persecuters* of their *Nation*. The *Myriads* St. *James* there speaks of were of those who did *believe*, and yet were *all zealous of the Law*,

Acts xxi. 20. This made the *Infor-*
mations of the *Roman Jews* so favou-
 rable to St. *Paul*. They were all de-
 riv'd from *Letters* out of *Judaea*, or
 from *Brethren* that came from thence,
 Acts xxviii. 21. This made the Cla-
 mours of the *Asiatick Jews* against
 St. *Paul* find so little *Credit* with the
unbelieving Jews, who wrote those
 Letters to their *Roman Brethren*, so
 many Years after those Tumults which
 occasion'd St. *Paul's* being sent Pri-
 soner to *Rome*, that the *unbelieving*
Jews were not only *satisfy'd*, but *pleas'd*
 with the Behaviour of the *Christians*
 of *Jerusalem*, whilst they were pos-
 sess'd with a like *Zeal* for the *Law* as
themselves were; and those *zealous*
Christians were not affected with the
 Slanders of the *Asiatics*, when he had,
 for their sakes, submitted himself to
 the *Legal Discipline* of a *Nazarite*.
 These Opinions of the *believing Jews*
 of *Jerusalem*, and the *Condescendence*
 of the *Apostles* in Favour of *them*,
 kept St. *James's* Case conceal'd, that
 even, at his *Martyrdom*, the *Jews*
 had the Confidence to appeal to him,
 what his Opinion was of our *Saviour*,
 if we may believe the Tradition of
Hegesippus. However, what hard O-
 pinion

pinion soever the *unbelieving Jews* of *Jerusalem* might have entertain'd concerning the particular Case of *St. Paul*, it does not appear that they had hitherto any *Provocation* from the *Body* of the *Christian Jews* of *Jerusalem*, that might exasperate the *Sanhedrin* to the *Encyclical Anathematisms* promulged by their *chosen Missionaries*. Yet when *St. James* himself was *Martyr'd*, who, by his *Wariness* and *Moderation*, had preserv'd *Union* between Persons of so *different Opinions*, as at last ended in a *Schism*; and kept up his *own Authority*, not only with *them*, but also with the *unbelieving Jews* themselves; that was a very likely Season for the *Zeal* of the *Persecuting Jews* to rise to the utmost *Extremities* against the *Christians*. And, if *St. James's* own *Opinion* was not known to the *unbelieving Jews* 'till then, as *Hegesippus* says, I should think it most likely that the *Breach* of *Communion*, between the *Christians* and *unbelieving Jews* in *Jerusalem*, could not begin before his *Martyrdom*. If so, it must have been between the *Year LXIII.* in which he *suffered*, and the *Year LXVI.* in which the *War* began, after which they could not send their *Encyclical Messengers*. And

XII.
 St. Paul's
Compliance
 not
 with the
 unbeliev-
 ing, but the
 believing,
 Jews of
 Jerusalem,
 was no-
 thing like
 the Occasi-
 onal Com-
 munion
 with an
 opposite
 Commu-
 nion de-
 fended by
 our Non-
 Confor-
 mists,

And now, from this Observation, it appears how perfectly *impertinent* this *Instance* was to the Purpose for which it was produc'd by our Adversaries. The *Compliance* here design'd was not with the *unbelieving Jews*, who had indeed no *Right* to partake in the *Eucharistical Altar*, Heb. xiii. 10. which was the *Altar* wherein the *Christians* communicated as *Christians*. How then could it be taken for an *Occasional Communion*? So far from that, that no *Christian* whatsoever could *communicate* with any other *Altar* besides that of St. *James*. I do not say *only* whilst he was in *Jerusalem*, but in whatsoever *particular Church* he communicated throughout the whole World. St. *Paul* himself, whom they take for the *chief* Asserter of the *contrary* Doctrine, always held a good *Correspondence* with St. *James*, and was as absolutely govern'd and concluded by him, as any of the *other* Apostles over whom *he* was placed by the Consent of those *Three* who had been formerly *themselves* the chief Apostles. How could he communicate with St. *James*, but he must communicate with those who were ἀπὸ Ἰερουσᾶλ, Gal. ii. 12. and with those
 My-

Myriads, who, though they were *zealous* for the *Law*, yet *believ'd*, and therefore must have been profess'd *Christians* of the *Diocess* of *Jerusalem* in which they liv'd? This was plain undeniable *Fact*, when *St. Paul* was present in *Jerusalem*. Nor could he avoid it, even when he was in *Asia*, even when he was *practicing* those *offensive* things which would have given *Scandal* to the *Christians* in *Jerusalem* who were *zealous* for the *Law*. Even then he *communicated* with them when he was *doing* those things, which, if they had *seen* them, would have been *offensive* to them. Not only, as *afterwards*, when all *Diocesses* were on *even* terms, and admitted *immediately* into the *Archetypal* and *Heavenly* Communion. That *Right* was then *peculiar* to the particular *Church* of *Jerusalem*, so that no other *Church* on *Earth* had any *Right* of admitting to Communion with the *Jerusalem* from above, which is the *Mother* of us all, than as she had a *Right* of admitting *Members* into the Communion of the *Earthy Ectypal* *Jerusalem*; for our *Saviour* and his *Apostles* were the *Archetypal Evangelical Church*. The *Apostles* then living, as such, related to the particular

Parænes.
§. 9, 10,
11, 12.

particular Church of Jerusalem. Whoever therefore would be united in one Body with them, must have obtain'd it by Incorporating himself with that one particular Church. Nor could he be ingrafted into the natural Jewish Olive, but by being admitted in that particular Church, which, at its first Constitution, consisted of none but Jews by Nation. This is St. Paul's own Doctrine, and therefore ought to be remember'd in order to the Discovery of his true Design. Where-ever therefore he communicated, he still communicated with that very Body whose Offence he was so careful to avoid, as far as was consistent with its Constitution by the Laws of the new Peculium. This Communion therefore was constant and stated, not only occasional. But he never once communicated with those Jews, who could not join in Communion in Holy Offices with uncircumcis'd Believers, as our Adversaries fancy. His partaking of the same Temple Sacrifices with them, did not imply his owning them of the new Peculium, 'till they could dispose themselves to communicate at our Evangelical Eucharistical Altar, to which Carnal Israelites had no Right.
It

It did not imply his *Union* with *them* on the *old Terms*, when he thought it necessary for himself to join with *uncircumcis'd Believers* in those *Offices* which *they* believ'd *unlawful*, but *he* thought *necessary* to intitle himself to the *new Peculium*. What he did, not as a *Member* of the *Peculium*, but of that particular *Nation*, he never did to gratifie *them* who kept off from the true *Communion*, and thought themselves *oblig'd* to do so by *Principles*, as our *Non-Conformists* do: But purely for their sake who were *actually* in the true *Communion*, and that upon such *Principles* as were likely to hold them *faster* than the *Prejudices* of their *Education*, if they might be allow'd a little time to disengage themselves by *degrees*. Those believing *Judaizers* of *St. James's Communion* had the Case of *Cornelius* publickly decided before them, by which it appear'd that *God* was pleas'd to admit *him* to the Favour of his *sanctifying Spirit* without any previous *Circumcision*, and by which they were warned no longer to look on such as he was, as *unclean*, and *unfit* to join in *Holy Offices*, for no other reason but their being *uncircumcis'd*. And they knew them-

themselves *oblig'd* to own this by the *Terms* of the *Communion* profess'd by them. They had withal receiv'd a full Account of the Progress of *St. Paul* and *Barnabas* in preaching to the *Gentiles*, and the *Miracles* by which God himself had seconded them. These things were publickly transacted *before* them, and had receiv'd *publick Testimonies* of Approbation from this very *Body*, which was principally concern'd in these *Condescensions*, which our Adversaries are pleased to plead as Arguments for *Occasional Communion*. In the former Case of *Cornelius*, they give it as their Opinion, upon hearing *St. Peter* : *Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted Repentance unto Life, Acts xi. 18.* In the latter, *St. Paul* and *Barnabas* caus'd great joy to all the *Brethren*, *Acts xv. 3.* And all the *Multitude* kept silence, and gave Audience to them, declaring what *Miracles and Wonders* God had wrought among the *Gentiles* by them, *v. 12.* Then follows the *Decree* of the *Apostles*, against imposing Circumcision on the *Gentiles*, with the *Consent* of the whole Church, *v. 22.* who can doubt but that all these things were transacted with the *Approbation* of those *Myriads*

ads of the *Jerusalem Christians* to whom *St. Paul* was so willing to give *Satisfaction*? And if so, who sees not how manifestly different their *Case* was from that of our present *Non-Conformists*? They were all of them in compleat *Communion*, not only *Occasional*. So are not the *Non-Conformists*. They had a *Deference* for the *Ecclesiastical Governors* of the *Communion* they profess'd stronger than their *Prejudices*, and thought themselves oblig'd by *Principles* to retain it. This secured them to the *Communion*, whenever the *Apostles* should be oblig'd, by the *Exigence* of the *Government*, to impose any thing on them contrary to the *Prejudices* of their *Education*. This would therefore make their *Errors* imputable to *Infirmity*, when they were so free from all *Hostile Designs* against the *Government*. Our *Non-Conformists* are malignantly disaffected not to the *Governors* only, but to the *Government* it self, and ascribe more to their weak conjectural *Reasonings* than to any *Decision* of *Governors*. They are for ruining the *Spiritual Government* which can alone unite us, and for ruining it by force. So far they are from uniting *Principles*, that
may

may oblige them in *Conscience* to continue united. Those believing *Judaizers* were firm in the main Point of communicating with *uncircumcised Believers*, only desiring to die in the Observance of what they had been inured to, neither defending it by *Principles* that would oblige any but their own *Nation*, nor concerned to propagate the Dispute, even in *Speculation*, beyond their own *Lines*. This would make their Case indeed worthy the *Compassion* of *Governors*, when they neither broke *Communion* themselves, nor persuaded or encourag'd any others to do so, nor impos'd their own *Opinions* on others, and were contented that Difference of Opinion should die with them. Not so our *Non-Conformists*. They are for defending their dividing *Practices* by *Principles* which may justify their making the like Divisions again. They are for imposing those *Principles* on others, and teaching them to their unprejudiced *Posterity*, and by that means propagating them to all succeeding *Generations*. What *Government* can think Persons so dispos'd qualify'd for *Favours* and *Indulgences* within their own *Body*?

Thus

Thus it appears how *late* it was before the *Christians* made a *distinct Communion* by themselves, if even those *circular Emissaries* had made them a *distinct Communion*. But I very much doubt whether they did so even *then*, if we judge of their being a *distinct Communion* by their being *excluded* from the *Temple Sacrifices*. It was not the Custom of the *Jews* to *exclude* any Criminal *Native Jew* from their *Sacrifices*, otherwise than by their *depriving* him of his *Life*. And whenever they *anathematiz'd* any for great Breaches of the *Law*, it seems generally to have been with a design of consigning him over to a *Capital Punishment*, by *Man*, if they could seize his *Person*; or by *God* himself and his punishing *Angels*, if he should *escape* the Punishment of *Man*. I know very well the *modern Rabbins* (if we heed them) make several *degrees* of *Excommunication* short of *Anathematisms*. But I know no Footsteps of them in the *undoubted Antiquities* of their *Ancestors*. Nothing in the *Scriptures*, nothing in *Philo* and *Josephus*, nothing in the *Apocryphal Hellenists*, nothing in those *nearer Times* that might derive Traditions

G

from

XIII.
The Anathematisms denounced against the Christians by the Sanhedrin were they, if any thing, that broke off the Communion of the Christian Jews with the Temple-worship.

from the Customs of the *Temple*. And what Monsieur *Pezron* has said is very considerable for proving the *lateness* of their *Mishnical* Text it self beyond what has been commonly believ'd, that it is no elder than the beginning of the *Sixth Century* of our *Christian* Account. The Power of *imprecating Curses capital* to be inflicted by God, seems to have been one of those Laws which we call commonly *Laws of Nature*, because we have no *written* Original of them, (however *positive* in their own *Nature*) as being made for the good of *Societies* in general, at the *first* Institution of *Societies*, long before the Invention of *Letters*, without which it was impossible to deduce the *Memory* of their first Institution to *Posterity*; for we find this very *Power* mention'd, and with *Approbation*, and as already *receiv'd* in all the ancient Monuments of those *civiliz'd Nations*, who can indeed pretend to *ancient Monuments*; and among *Nations* who had no *Commerce* with each other, by which they might derive it from any *one Nation* of greater *Authority* than the rest, which makes it therefore more probable to have been deriv'd from *separate*, but agreeable

ble Revelations for the good of *Societies* before the Settlement of *Commerce*. These *Imprecations* were indeed the Security of *Justice* where-ever *Human Securities* were insufficient, of the *oppressed* against the *Oppressors*, of *Predecessors* against *Successors*, of *Covenants* in general, even among *Equals*, when either of the contracting Parties might grow too strong for *Coercion* by the other. On this Account God was pleased to require it from his *Peculium*, as a Security for their Stipulations with *himself*, that they should imprecate *Curses* against *themselves*, to be inflicted on them by God, by their own *Consent* and *Contract*, in case *themselves* should break the Security given by them for Performance of what had been stipulated on *their* part. Thus the *Blessings* and *Curses* on Mount *Ebal* and Mount *Gerizim* are provided as the perpetual Security for the *National Covenant* of the *old Peculium* with God for *all* succeeding *Generations*. And the *Song* of *Moses* was design'd as a never failing Remembrance, as well of the *Curses* which would be incurred by the violating of their *Covenant*, as of the *Blessings* which might be hop'd as the Rewards of

their Observation. The *Anathematisms* therefore authoritatively denounc'd by the *Sacred Powers* against the *Breakers* of the *Law* were *Authentic* Declarations that they had incurred the *Curses* imprecated on their own Heads by *themselves*, when they were first solemnly initiated themselves into the sacred *Covenant* with the *God* of their *Nation*, and confirm'd by those *Imprecations* so customary then in ratifying *Covenants*. But this solemn Denunciation was with a Design of laying an *Obligation* on the *God* with whom the *Covenant* was made, to do *his* part in *inflicting* the *Curses* to which the *Person* *Covenanting* had made himself liable by his own Act of *Imprecation*. And the *Curse* being *Capital*, these solemn *Anathematisms* were to oblige *God*, and the *Community* concern'd in the *Covenant*, to take Care that the *Covenant Breaker* might be punish'd with *Death*. The *Covenant* it self was with the whole *Nation* of the *old Peculium*, as well as with each single *Member* of it. This brought the *Nation* under the Guilt, if they were negligent in punishing *single Persons* when they prov'd guilty of these *Capital Violations* of the *National Covenant*.

venant. That very Neglect contracted a *Contagion* of Guilt to the *whole Nation*, 'till the Expiation of the Guilt made by the *Death* of the *Criminal*, if he were a *private* Person. So the whole *Body* of the *Israelites* were punish'd by God by the Successes of the Men of *Ai*, and could expect no better 'till the *Piaculum* was atton'd by the Death of *Achan* and his *Family*. So, in other Cases, the same *Body* was clear'd from the *Contagion* of Punishment by hanging up the *Heads* of the *People*, by hanging up *Seven* of the innocent Posterity of *Saul*, by *Phineas's* killing *Zimri* and *Cozbi*, and by every particular Person's killing his *Criminal Relation*, how near foe-ver ally'd to him. These publick *Anathematisms* therefore were a Consignation of the Criminals to the *Divine Vengeance* imprecated by themselves, and a *Delivery* of them, when thus depriv'd of the *Divine Protection*, into the Power of the *Evil Angels* who were the ordinary *Ministers* of such *Divine Inflictions*, 'till the whole *Body* should be forc'd to clear their Country of them, either by *Death*, or *Banishment*, or *Slavery*. Each of these *Punishments* made the

Person so punish'd cease to be a *Citizen*, which when he was *not*, the *Community* was no longer responsible for him. But neither could *he*, from that time forward, pretend any *Right* to the *Sacra* of his *Country*. Thus it was among the *Heathens*. Among the *Jews* I do not remember that either *Banishment* or *Slavery* were accepted of as an *Attonement* for any *Piacular* Offences of so high a Nature as this is. *Death* therefore was design'd against Persons thus *anathematiz'd* for *Breach* of the *Law*, as soon as they could get them into their *Power*. And therefore I know no *Instances* of such Persons *excluded* from their *Sacrifices*. They could not *communicate* in their *publick Sacrifices* unless they were at *Jerusalem*. And if they were *there* they had then been in the *Power* of their *Anathematizers* to execute their own Sentence on them, as far as they were permitted to do so by the *Roman Laws*. And the *Zea-*
lots very readily laid hold on *Opportunities* of executing them. *Ananus*, the High-Priest, a bigotted *Sadducee*, took the Advantage of the *Vacancy* of the *Præfectship* of *Judæa*, (between the Death of *Festus* and the Arrival of *Albinus*)

Albinus) for the *Martyrdom* of *St. James*. This made it not so necessary to denounce a *distinct* Sentence for *excluding* such Persons from the *Temple Sacrifices*, when the *Capitalness* of the *Anathematism* was alone sufficient to put it out of their *Power* to *communicate* at the *Altar* of the *Temple*. Thus therefore the *anathematizing* the *Christians* might still leave them at *liberty* to *communicate* with the *Altar* it self, if they would *venture* upon it at the *Peril* of their *Lives*. But, however this matter was, the *Anathematism* it self, as it was a consigning the Person so censur'd to the *Power* of *Evil Spirits*, was alone, I think, sufficient, in the *Opinion* of the *Anathematizers*, to *cut* them *off* from the *Right* of *Communion* with those who had inflicted those *Censures* on them. *Piacular Crimes*, in the *Opinion* of the *Heathens* themselves, were thought to expose Men to the *Furies* or *Eumenides*, who (being of the *Evil* sort of *Dæmons*) made those, who were in their *Power*, *uncapable* of *Communion* with good *Dæmons*. So true it was, that there was no *connexion* allow'd between the *Spirits* of *Light* and *Darkness*, by the *Notions* of the *Heathens*

38 *Against Occasional Communion.*

also, to which St. *Paul* alludes in his reasoning concerning *unequal Marriages*. This was the reason why the *Christian Excommunications* were thought to do so too. They were a *Delivery to Satan for the Punishment of the Flesh*, by *Distractions* and other *Diseases*, and *Death* it self. And that was alone sufficient to pollute the Persons so delivered into the Power of that unclean Spirit, and to make them unfit for the Communion of the good Spirit, there being no Communion betwixt Christ and *Belial*. That was the Case of the *Energumeni*, though under no judicial Sentence of Excommunication.

XIV.

Before this Breach the Communion of the Jewish Christians with the Jews in the Temple was constant: After, their Communion with the unbelieving Jews was unlawful. In neither Case only Occasional

Thus far therefore the *peculiar Duties* of the *Christian Communion* could not be so clearly discoverable in *Practice*, whilst the *Christians* made no *distinct Communion* by themselves. Nor could the *Sacred Writers* have any occasion, for this space, to mention any *Instances* of *Occasional Communion*, as contradistinct to the *stated*. 'Till the Case of *Cornelius*, *Circumcision* was the *only* Rite of Initiation into the *Peculium*, as consisting only of *Jews* by *Extraction*, or *Profelytes* incorporated into the *Jewish Nation*. Thus

Thus long therefore *Baptism* did not admit into the *Peculium*, but the particular *Heresy* of the *Nazarens*, in the sense that *Word* was understood by the *Jews* of that time, not as a distinct *Communion*, but as a distinct *School* subordinate to the *Sanhedrin*, and united with the other Jewish *Heresies* in the same *Communion* of the *Temple*. All *Christians* therefore then were of the *Temple Communion*, not only occasionally, but *statedly*. And even occasional *Communion* in any *Holy Offices* with *uncircumcis'd* Adults, was by the *Apostles* themselves judg'd *unlawful*, 'till they were *convinc'd* of the contrary by the *Divine Revelation* receiv'd on *that* occasion. Before this there could have been no occasional *Communion* with the *Gentiles*, who were the only Persons that were capable of occasional *Communion*, when all Mankind was contain'd under the Division of *Jews* and *Gentiles*. St. *Peter* professes he never had *communicated* with them. That was truly his meaning by his never having *eaten* of any thing that was *common* or *unclean*, Acts x. 14. xi. 8. with regard to the *Command* given him in the *Vision*. And it is plain the *rest* of the *Apo-*
stles

stles and the Church of *Jerusalem* were of his Mind, by their calling him to Account for his communicating with *Cornelius*, and their not being otherwise satisfy'd than by his Report of that same *Vision* which had alter'd his own Judgment concerning that Case. From that time forward, *Baptism* was the Rite of *Initiation* into the new *Peculium*, as it took in the *uncircumcis'd* as well as the *circumcis'd*; and the *Apostles* were the *Heads*, not now (as formerly) of a new *School*, or a new *Heresy*; but of a new, and a more noble, *Peculium*. Therefore it is that the Apostle tells us that *Circumcision* avail'd nothing, Gal. v. 6. Because it could not alone, as formerly, without *Baptism* incorporate them into the new *Peculium*, without the *καὶνὴ κτίσις*, Gal. vi. 15. 2 Cor. v. 17. As *κτίσις*, signifies a new *Colony*. That new *Colony* was the new *Heaven*, and the new *Jerusalem* from above, which is the *Mother* of us *Christians*, as the *earthly Jerusalem* was of the *Jews*. And of this our *Saviour* is the *κτίστης*, and is to give *Name* to the *Colony*, and to receive the *Honours* of a *κτίστης* from all the *Colony*, among which some were *Divine*, according to that
lower

lower Notion of *Divinity* then receiv'd among the *Heathens*. But he a higher, as the *Heavenly Colony* was beyond Comparison above all *earthly Colonies*, and as the *Αὐτόθεος*, which was stil'd *αὐτόθεος*, was suppos'd to be the *Original* of that *Divine Nature* (as the *Scripture* calls it as well as the *Heathens*) that was thought communicable to *Creatures*. Accordingly we are also said to have an *Altar*, whereof they have no Right to eat which serve the *Tabernacle*, Ebr. xiii. 10. Plainly implying that the *Legal Priesthood* could no more intitle any *Communicant* to a Participation with the *Heavenly Archetypal Sacrifice*, without our *Christian Eucharist*, than the *Legal Circumcision* could admit a *Citizen* of the *Heavenly Archetypal Jerusalem* without our *Christian Baptism*. In this State therefore of *Christianity* the *Jewish Observations* were so far vacated, as that none of them could intitle the *Observers* of them to the true *Peculium* without our *Christian Sacraments*. And therefore all the *Obligation* of the *Mosaic Law* upon the *Jewish Nation* it self did not concern them as a *Peculium*, but as a particular *Nation*, that could now, no longer,

longer, lay Claim to the *peculiar* Privileges of *Favourites*. The Advantage therefore of the *Jew* above the *Gentile* so often acknowledg'd and insisted on by *St. Paul* himself, was only to be understood of those *Jews* who qualify'd themselves for it by an *intire* Submission to the Terms of the *new Peculium*, which could only be by *stated*, not *occasional Communion*. They had indeed a *Priority* of the *Gentiles* even in the *new Peculium*, not only as the *new Peculium* was grounded on the *Foundations* of the *Prophets*, but of the *Apostles* also, and as all the first Converts to the *Christian Religion* were no other but *Jews* by *Nation*, and as our *wild Olive* was *ingrafted* into their *Natural Olive*, and partook of their *Fatness* and *Fruitfulness*, that is, of the *Mystical Benefits* of the *Promises* made to a *Body* consisting originally of none but *Jews* by *Nation*. When therefore the *new Peculium* was thus establish'd, there could be no Pretence for any *Communion* that was only *occasional*. The *Native Jews* were oblig'd to *constant* and *stated Communion* in our *Christian Sacraments*. And by being so oblig'd, they must have profess'd themselves *one* with all
the

the *Christian Brotherhood*, and divided from all those who were divided from the *Christians*. What Place could then remain for any *Communion* that could be properly call'd *Occasional*, when they were oblig'd constantly to communicate with the *Christians*, and never to communicate with any *Communion* divided from the *Christians*, so much as *Occasionally*? That which might look most like an *occasional Communion* in this Period, would be when the *Jewish Christians* communicated with the *Temple*. But when that *Temple Communion* was not taken for the *ordinary Communion* wherein all *Christians*, as *Christians*, were oblig'd to agree, and by which alone they could hope to be made Partakers of the *Mystical and Heavenly Communion*, there could be nothing in it inconsistent with the true *Christian Communion*; nothing that could hinder both *Communities*, either with the *Temple* or the *Church*, from being constant; nothing that could confine either of them to rare occasions of communicating, when occasions of communicating, in either kind, were frequent and easie to be had. Both *Jewish and Gentile Christians* might constantly communicate in
the

the Church. Yet the *Christian Jews* might as constantly communicate with *Temple Offices*, as the *Christian Gentiles* were oblig'd constantly to forbear them. But this *Variety* of the two *Cases* was of no more consequence for proving a *Variety* of *Communion*s, than the like *Variety* is of *private* Interests of *subordinate* Bodies, of *Countries*, *Provinces*, *Cities*, and inferior *Subdistinctions* in the *Catholick Communion*. There are in these also *general Spiritual* Concerns of *private* Bodies, wherein *all* the *Members* of those same *Bodies* are concern'd, which notwithstanding are *not* common to the whole *Communion*. In Affairs of this nature each *Communicant* may have *Communicants* with him in *one* *Body*, who do not communicate with him in *another* *Body*, wherein *he* may, though *they* cannot, claim an Interest. Thus it was that in the *Temple-worship* the *believing Jews* communicated with them who were *Unbelievers*, who had no *Right* to communicate with them in the *Eucharist*. Yet even that *Communion* was not *occasional* only, but as *constant* as their *Communion* with the *Temple*. However this *Communion* it self seems to have *broken off* after the *Sanhedrin*

Sanhedrin (by its *Anathematisms* against the *Christians*) had made their own a *distinct Communion*; from that time forward we find no single *Christian*, who communicated with the *Jews*, so much as *occasionally*. Their own *Anathematisms*, no doubt, drew on them the like *Denunciations* from the *Apostles* upon the *whole Body* of the *unbelieving Jews*, as the local *Anathematisms* of the *Synagogues* of single *Cities* had done before on those *Cities* where the *Synagogues* had so misbehav'd themselves. And as the *Apostles* separated from such *Synagogues*, so, when the *whole Body* of the *Jews* had involv'd themselves in the same *Guilt*, it was agreeable to their *Principles* to separate from all *Holy Commerce* with the *unbelieving Jews*. In *Iconium* the *multitude of the City* was divided; (*ἐξείδν* is the Word) and part held with the *Jews*, and part with the *Apostles*, *Acts* xiv. 4. So at *Ephesus*, *St. Paul* departs from the *Synagogue*, and separates the *Disciples*, disputing daily in the *School of Tyrannus*, *Acts* xix. 9. ἀποσὰς ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ἀρῶσις. The Words are full for a *distinct Communion* in the *Language*, even of the later *Canons*. They were

were thenceforward *different Bodies*, and had their *Assemblies* in *different Places*, and *opposite* to each other. The same, in all likelihood, was the Case with the *whole Body* of the *unbelieving Jews* from the time of those *Anathematisms* of the *Sanhedrin*. In the *Revelations* we find mention of them which said they were *Jews*, and were not, but were the *Synagogue of Satan*, ii. 9. So again: *The Synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews, and are not*, but do lie, iii. 9. These can hardly be the *Ebionites*, but the *unbelieving Jews*. The *βλασφημία*, *Apoc.* ii. 9. is that which is so frequently taken notice of in the *unbelieving anathematizing Jews* in the *Acts*, as that which gave the Apostles occasion to shake off the *Dust* of their *Feet* against them. That, and their *Persecutions*, v. 9. 10. are rather Notes of those *Jews* who did not own the Name of *Christ*, than of the *Christian Ebionites*. And the inveteracy of the *Jews*, when it was in their *Power* to *Persecute*, appear'd in that same Church of *Smyrna*, at the *Martyrdom* of that very *Angel* of that Church, *St. Polycarp*, and before that in *Barcochba's* Rebellion, in *Hadrian's* Time, in
St.

St. *Justine* Martyr. And the *Seven Jewish Heresies* mention'd by the same St. *Justine* and *Hegesippus* were very active, even in the *beginning* of the *Breach*, as appear'd in the *Martyrdom* of St. *James*, our Lord's Brother, the Bishop of *Jerusalem*. When therefore St. *John* denies them to be what they pretended, really *Jews*, his meaning is no other than that of St. *Paul*, when he also asserts the *true Circumcision* to *Christians*, and calls the *Jews*, κατὰ τοὺς, rather than περιτομῶν. Nay *Dogs*, as our Saviour did the *Syrophænician* Woman, purposely to distinguish her from the *Holy Seed* of the *Peculium*. And as the same Apostle claims all the *Promises* made to the *Seed* of *Abraham*, as belonging rather to the *Seed* of his *Faith* than of his *Flesh*. He means they were neither *Israelites* nor *Jews*, as those Names are glory'd in, or signifying the *chosen People* of the *true Peculium*. So far from that that he stiles them *the Synagogue of Satan*, and makes the *Devil* the Author of their *Persecutions*, Rev. ii. 10, 13. and their *Mysteries* the βασιλεὺς τῆς Σατανᾶς, v. 24. and their chief Residence, the *Throne* and *Dwelling* of *Satan*, v. 13. Exactly as *Ignatius*
H makes

makes them, λατρεύειν τῷ διαβόλῳ, who did not keep close to the *Communion* of the *Bishop*. And as the *New Testament* owns no middle between *Light* and *Darkness*, *Christ* and *Belial*, the *Power of Satan*, and the *Power of God*: Plainly supposing all who are out of the true *Communion* to be, for that very Reason, in the *Power of Evil Spirits*, as having no Title to the *Divine Spirit* of God, which was the *Bond* of the *Mystical Unity* of *Christ's Mystical Body*, nor to the *Protection* of those good *Spirits*, who are *ministring Spirits* only for the *Heirs of Salvation*, Ebr. i. 14. This certainly could leave no room for any *Communion*, so much as *occasional*, with the *Jews*. No conscientious *Christian* could venture himself among the *Communion* of them whom a Person of so great Authority had declar'd to be the *Synagogue of Satan*.

XV.
'Till this Breach was made, there was no reason to expect a distinct Account of the particular Nature of the Christian Communion.

So late it was before the *Christians* were settled on their own Foundations as a *distinct Communion*, subsisting separately as a *distinct Body* by themselves on those Principles which were peculiar to them as *Christians*. It was not 'till the end of the History of the *Acts* of the *Apostles*, which pretends to

to no distinct Account of what was transacted in the Cause of *Christianity* after *St. Paul's* Arrival at *Rome*. No, not within the *Two Years* which it tells us that he continu'd there. Yet 'till they did indeed subsist as such a *separate Body*, the Offices due to their *own Body*, and the *Obligation* following from thence in relation to *other Bodies* for *avoiding* them so far as they were *inconsistent* with their *Duty* to their *own*, could not be so distinctly understood before they were reduc'd to *Practice*. Practice was that which made them *known* to every *Member*, when the *Case* was *put*, and they were *oblig'd* to *act*, and to *act uniformly*, and under the Direction of their common *Superiors*. And the remarkable Events then likely to follow upon the *ferment* that would be occasion'd by the *Practice* were they, which would oblige a *Prudent Historian* to take notice of them, who would not think himself concern'd to take notice of bare *Speculations* of what *might* probably have follow'd, if it did not *actually* come to pass. The mentioning such things *before* they came into *Practice* could not have been expected from even a profess'd *Historian*, much less from

such as had no occasion to mention any thing *Historical* otherwise than *incidentally*, as it fits their Principal Design which was very different from that of writing *History*. And of this sort are *all* the Writings of the *New Testament*, which are *later* than the *Acts* of the *Apostles*. We have therefore no reason to expect this *Offence* of the *Jews*, upon the Division of Communion from them in any Writing *ancienter* than the *end* of the *Acts* of the *Apostles*, nor consequently any clear Accounts on either side of the *Jews* or *Christians*, concerning the *Nature* of our *Christian Communion* in *general*, as settled on the *Principles* of *Christianity*; whether it was thought *consistent* with any *Communion* with the *unbelieving Jews*, even so much as *occasional*. Much less could it appear, that the yet surviving *Apostles* would have *allow'd* any of their *own Communicants* to *communicate* with *themselves* only *occasionally*, and to *communicate* *statedly* and *constantly* with the *unbelieving Jews*. Thus far therefore our *Doctrine* concerning *Communion* might have been *true*, and perfectly *agreeable* to the *Sense* of the *Apostles*, though nothing could appear by which
it

it might be *prov'd* to be so from this *first* part of the *Apostolical History*. That is enough to overthrow their *Negative Reasoning* from this *former* part of the *Apostolical History*.

The true *Season* indeed that would make the *Christian Doctrine* of the *Nature* of their *Communion* appear, was when the first *Separations* were made from that *first Communion* which had its *Original* from the *Apostles* themselves. The *Disputes* rais'd on that occasion oblig'd the *Catholicks* to notify their *own* Sense of it, as the *Topick* necessary to be insisted on in order to the *Conviction* of *Dividers* of the *Danger* of their *separate State*, and their *Obligation*, on *Account* of their *Spiritual Interests*, to return to the *Communion* from whence they had fallen: Their *own* *Division* from the *Jewish Communion*, rather *occasion'd* than *settled* their *own*, as a *distinct Communion*. At the first the *Christians* were merely *passive*, and made no degrees in it but such as the *Jews* *provok'd* them to. The *Apostles* did not shake off the *Dust* of their *Feet* against the *Jews*, 'till the *Jews* of the *Place* where they did so had first *blasphem'd* and *anathematiz'd* the *worthy Name*

XVI.
The properest Season for expecting this Account was in the latter end of the Age of the Apostles.

by which they were call'd. Nor did they carry the *Separation* further than the particular *Synagogue* that provok'd them to it. The *Separations*, even from the *Hellenistical Synagogues*, were not *universal* 'till the *Provocations* were so also. But the *Separation* from the *Temple-worship* was not before the *Anathematisms* of the *Sanhedrin*, which was too late to be observ'd in the *greatest* part of the *Sacred History*. Yet this gave them rather occasion to insist on what was *amiss* in the *Jewish Communion* than what was *necessary* in their *own*. That *Separation* from the *Jews* oblig'd them to Act *separately*, and to provide for themselves as a *distinct Body* under the Conduct of the *Apostles*. But then the *Apostles* made that Provision, as they did in other Cases, not all at *once*, but by *degrees*, as God was pleas'd to direct them by his *Revelations*. The *last Revelation* was that which compleated it. And it is impossible now to know how near that might have been to the *end* of the *Apostles Age*. That very much depended on their *Disposition* to receive it, if it had any thing remarkably *repugnant* to the *Prejudices* of their former *Jewish Education*, and proper
to

to the Constitution of the *new Peculium*. However the surest Reasonings of this kind are to be expected from the *latest Times* of the *Apostolical Age*. Then the *Prejudices* of their *former Education*, which *hinder'd* the *seasonableness* of those *Evangelical Revelations*, which introduc'd any unexpected or surprizing *Change*, were most compleatly remov'd. Then they were most *dispos'd* to *Obedience* to any *new Impositions* that God was pleas'd to lay on them by the *Apostles*. Then the *Apostles* were most of all concern'd that the *Church* should not be left *destitute* of any thing *necessary* for its Subsistence, which should require that *highest degree* of *Inspiration* which was to expire with the *Persons* of the *Apostles*. Then the failing of so many other *extraordinary Offices* grounded on the *extraordinary χάρισμα*, which were *not* to be expected by *Successors*, must oblige them to settle the *Obligation* to *Communion* on the *Benefits* of *Communion*, which could only be expected from even that *lower Constitution* which could not expect those *extraordinary Gifts* which intitled to *extraordinary Offices*, which were all, in course, to *expire* with

that *Age of Extraordinaries*. This is, in truth, that *Constitution* for which we are concern'd in our present Disputes, relating to Duty *now*, when we are no longer to depend on any hopes of *Extraordinaries*. And this could not be thoroughly understood 'till the *end* of the *Apostolical Age*, in a near Prospect of the *Death* of those Persons, whose *extraordinary Gifts* intitled them to those *Offices* which were to expire with their *Persons*. The *ordinary Offices* of the *Church* are those of *Bishops, Priests* and *Deacons*, which are most rarely mention'd in that part of the *Sacred History* where the Principal *Discipline* of the *Church* depended on those *extraordinary Offices* of *Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists* and *Teachers*, which very *Offices* were to *expire* with the *extraordinary Gifts* which were not ordinarily to be *expected* after that particular *Age*. As the *Gifts* were *greater*, so the *Evidences* of those *Gifts* were *clearer*, in that *former* part of the *Apostolical History*, than in the *later* wherein the *ordinary Government* and *ordinary Communion* were settled, which were to be deriv'd to *future Ages*. That Consideration must
make

make the *Benefits* of Communion greater, and accordingly the *loss* of Communion more *detrimental*, in the *Apostles Age* than *afterwards*, as to the *Benefits* of the Communion in *this Life*. But as to the *other Life*, the *Benefit* of the *ordinary Communion*, makes us *one Body* with the *Apostles* themselves, and the ancient *Patriarchs*, and indeed with the whole *Church Triumphant*, and intitles us to our *share* of all that is enjoy'd by any of *them*. They are the *Forerunners*, and have taken Possession in the Name of all that are to *follow* as well as for *themselves*. They are the *First-fruits*, and derive their *Consecration* to the *whole Body*, as the *Consecration* of the *First-fruits* was suppos'd to communicate a *Consecration* to the whole *Harvest*, such as might make it fit for the uses of the whole *Holy People*. Their having *Possession* of the *Earnest* intitles us all to the *whole Payment*, when we also shall have perform'd the *Duty* requisite on *our part*. And although they only be *Personally* in *Heaven*, yet *we*, also, as *one Body* with them, are said *already* to *sit down* with them in *Heavenly Places*. The *Apostle* reasons, not only concerning our *Fellow-Members*,

Members, but our *Head* himself, that we must as certainly *rise* and possess what *he* is possess'd of in *Heaven*, as *he* has *risen* and is possess'd of the *Promises* made to our *whole Body*. However the *Nature* of this *Communion*, as to its *Ordinaries* (for which alone we are concern'd in this *Dispute*) could not have been expected to have been so *universally* known as in the *latter* end of the *Apostles*, when they were in a prospect of the *failing* of their *Extraordinaries*. Indeed hardly 'till there were *Divisions* of *Communion* among the *Christians* themselves. That was, in *Truth*, the proper *Season* for clearing the *Nature* and *Necessity* of *Church-Communion*, when that *Topick* was principally to be insisted on in the *Disputes* with the *Dividers*, for proving their *Obligation* to *return* to the *Communion* *deserted* by them. But even the *Dividers* had such a *Veneration* for the *Authority* of the *Apostles*, that they had not the *Confidence* to make an open *Separation* whilst the *Apostles* themselves were *living*, as we are assur'd by *Hegesippus*. What they had done *before* was only *Clandestine*, rather the *forsaking* the receiv'd *Assemblies* than the setting up of any *new* ones

ones proper to themselves in *Opposition* to them, *Ebr. x. 25*. That could not be so *notorious* a warning, nor could lay an *Obligation* to be so *clear* in this matter as afterwards. It is therefore very strange that our Adversaries should object to *Ignatius* his greater *Perspicuity* in the Question concerning the *Obligation* to *Church-Communion* than what we find in the *Scriptures* themselves. It was indeed the properest *time* for *expecting Perspicuity* herein, if they had been pleas'd to consider it.

Thus then it appears that *our Evidence* against *Occasional Communion* from the *consentient Tradition* of the *next Ages*, immediately succeeding the *Apostles*, is really a *firmer* proof of the *Sense* of the *Apostles* themselves concerning this *Particular* than *can*, in reason, be expected from the *Scripture* it self. This would alone be sufficient for carrying our *Cause* against our Adversaries *Reasonings* from *Scripture*, though we had as little positive *direct proof* of our *Doctrine* from the *Scripture* as our Adversaries pretend we have. It *might* notwithstanding have been the *Sense* of the *Apostles*, and been *prov'd* to have been so from the

XVII.
The latest
Scriptures
are clear
against the
Doctrins of
Occasional
Communion.

the foremention'd *Tradition*, though they had not signify'd their Minds in their own *Age* and their own *Writings*, having so little *Obligation* then to *signifie* their *Sense* of it, as I have already prov'd. Yet my *Cause* does not oblige me to insist on this *Prescription* against our Adversaries, as if we wanted even this *Accessory* Proof from the *Scripture* it self; for my part I think we have more to say for our selves from *that* very Topick than *they* have, if we try the *Merit* of the *Cause* rather from *Scripture Principles* than from *Scripture Facts* not sufficiently understood. And who can doubt but that this is, as well the *certainer*, as the *fairer*, way? The Word *κοινωνία* for *Communion* is *Scriptural*, and *Scriptural* also in that very *Sense* in which we are concern'd for it. St. *John* in his *first* most *unquestionable Epistle* uses it when he requires from them he writes to, that they should *communicate* with himself and his other surviving Collegues of the *Apostles*, 1 *John* i. 3. of the *Ephesine* College, as I have elsewhere shewn. This was an *External Communion* in *that Age*; for upon the Conversions of *Profelytes* to the *Church*, the *Profelytes* distinguish'd them-

themselves from the *Unbelievers* by their adhering to the *Apostles*, Acts xiv. 4. That was by their frequenting, and confining themselves to, those *Assemblies* only which were headed by the *Apostles*. So *S. Clemens Romanus* shews that the *συνάθροισμός* of the believing *Christians* was to *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* their first Converters. Indeed their relation to the *Catholick Church* requir'd, that *External Union* with the *Apostles*, as I have prov'd in my *Parænesis*, §. 34. This *κοινωνία* also in the *Scripture* Notion was to be maintain'd by *visible Sacraments*. It was the *κοινωνία* of the *Ecclesiastical Bread* which intitled Persons then to the *κοινωνία* with the *Body of Christ*, 1 Cor. x. 16. that is, which made them *Members* of the *visible Church*, which is frequently call'd his *Body*. This *Eucharist* serv'd the *Christians* for the same purposes as the *visible Altars* did the *Jews* and *Heathens*. With *Israel*, they who did eat the *Sacrifices* are said to be *κοινωνοὶ* of the *Altar*, v. 17, 18. as they who partook of the *Sacrifices* that were offer'd to the *Devils* are likewise said to be *κοινωνοὶ τῶν δαιμονίων*, v. 20. And drinking of the *Cup* of the *Lord* and the
Cup

Cup of Devils, and partaking of the Table of the Lord, and of the Table of Devils are made exactly answerable, v. 21. What can be clearer hence than that our Christian Eucharist did as much confederate Christians into one Body as the Sacrifices either of the Jews or Heathens did? And that it did as much distinguish them from all other Bodies, who had no Right to partake in their Eucharist, which the Jews are said not to have, Ebr. xiii. 10. and much less the Heathens? And that one single Act of κοινωνία, with any other Communion whatsoever, did as much cut off from the Christian Communion, as one single Act of Communion at the Table of Devils was always suppos'd to do? The reason was the same in all of the like kind: That one single Act of Communion made the Communicant one with the Body to which the Communion belong'd, and therefore must as effectually divide him from the Body own'd by him formerly, if the Body were divided from it into which he had been receiv'd by his new Act of Communion. That is not all. The Scripture does also insist on this Argument, and with this very Design to shew

shew that they who have not a *Right* to the same κοινωνία, ought not to maintain any *Sacred Commerce* with each other. So the Apostle; *What Communion hath Light with Darknes?* 2 Cor. vi. 14. Τίς ἡ κοινωνία is his Word. His Inference from the no κοινωνία is. *Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my Sons and Daughters, saith the Lord Almighty, v. 17, 18.* Here is plainly an expresse Command for separating from those who have not the *Right* of κοινωνία accommodated to this Case from the Prophet *Isaiah*. Here is a *Reason* also supposed obliging them to obey this Command, taken from the receiv'd Notions concerning the *Peculium*, that all other *Communications* were *unclean*, and deriv'd a *Contagion* of *Uncleanness* to the *Communicants* inconsistent with the *Holiness* of the *Peculium*, and which therefore must *deprive* them of the *Privileges* of the *Peculium*, who had involved themselves in that *Contagion* by not separating from the *Communion* of such *unclean Dividers*. That this was
their

their Condition appears from the following Words, wherein God does not undertake to *receive* them, or to be their *Father*, or to *accept* of them for his *Children*, on any other Terms than those of *separating*. from those who could pretend to no *Right of Communion* with the *true Church*. It is very plain that, by this *Reasoning*, it is suppos'd to be as *unlawful* to communicate in any *Holy Offices* with those of *another Communion*, independent on that which was *Catholick*, as it had been to have join'd with those who were *legally unclean* in any *Temple Offices*. And it is withal as plain that this *Reasoning* is allow'd as good under the *Gospel* as it had been under the *Law*. Accordingly St. *John* requires that no *Orthodox Communicant* should *receive* such a *Communicant* of *another Communion* into his *House*, nor bid him *God speed*; for (says he) he that biddeth him, *God speed*, is *Partaker* of his *evil Deeds*, Epist. ii. v. 10, 11. That *salutatory Prayer* was one of the *lowest Acts* of *Holy Communion* with him. Yet even that this Sacred Author judges sufficient to involve such a *Saluter* in the *Communion* of a Person so saluted, and to make him

him chargeable with all the Guilt belonging to it as a *separate Communion*. Κοινωνεῖ is his Word, by which it appears that even these *salutatory Prayers* were at least, in the *latter end* of the *Apostles Age*, taken for Acts of *Ecclesiastical Communion*. This is judg'd to be the Case of him who did not IIIYX
 μένειν ἐν τῇ διδασκῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, v. 9. who did not keep firm to the *School* of *Christ*, where they were all to be taught of God, to own *Christ* for their Master and Rabbi in the Language of the *Jews*, and the *Apostles* whilst they liv'd, and after them the *Bishops* who succeeded the *Apostles* in that very Office of being the *Head Masters* of the *Schools* where they presided. That was the reason why the *Apostle* requires that a *Bishop* should be διδασκτικός, 1 *Tim.* iii. 2. That is, that he should have the λόγος διδασκῆς, and διδασκαλίας, *Tit.* i. 9. as one of the most necessary χαρίσματα for his *Preaching Function*, which in those earliest Times was most appropriated to the *Bishops*. How could they then allow any *occasional Communion* with Persons of other *Communities* when they thought those *opposite Communities* so inconsistent with any Claim to the
 I Rights

Rights of the Peculium, and thought withal that the lowest degrees of Sacred Offices were sufficient to involve themselves in the same common Cause, and to make them liable to the same irreparable Losses?

XVIII.

And that by the certainest way of interpreting their true Sense, rather from their Principles than from naked Facts.

Nor was this Duty of avoiding *opposite Communions* only true in *Fact*, (which yet is the uttermost that our Adversaries pretend to for their Cause, had they been as successful as themselves could wish in the Proof hitherto attempted by them) but *necessary*, obliging them by the *Principles* then generally receiv'd and reason'd on concerning the *Benefits* of the true *Orthodox Communion*, and the *Mischiefs* of all *other Communions* opposite to that one *true Communion*, for that very reason, because they were *opposite*. I begin with the *Reason* insisted on by St. John the Apostle for persuading the *Dividers* of his Time to his own *Communion* of the surviving *Apostles* headed by himself at *Ephesus*: *And truly our Fellowship, κοινωνία, is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ, 1 John i. 3.* who sees not that the force of his *Reasoning* here consists in this, that by their *κοινωνία* with the *Apostles* they might expect a *κοινωνία* with

with the *Father* and the *Son*; and that, if they neglected this way of intitling themselves to the *Heavenly Communion* by uniting themselves to the *Earthly Communion* under the *visible* authoriz'd *Representatives* of the *Father* and the *Son*, they could not pretend to any *Communion* with the *Father* and the *Son* themselves. These *Heads of Mystical Union* secur'd the true *Christian Communion* against all other *visible Communions* then in view, or that could be expected afterwards. As the *Communion* with the *Father* could not be had without it, it oblig'd the *Jews* to enter into it, and not to continue an *opposite Communion* by themselves. Even that old *Peculium* which had formerly a *Communion* with the *Father* without any *express* Recognition of the *Son* was now to expect it no longer, and must lose their *Communion* with the *Father* if they did not also communicate with the *Son*. Nor could any *Gentile Profelytes* now any more expect to communicate with the *Father*, by their Admission into the *Jewish Communion* without communicating with the *Christians* also, who had been form'd into a *Communion* immediately by the *Son* also. The

Reason was, because the *προσαγωγή*, the *Admission* to the *Father*, was indeed the Office of the *Λόγος*, without whom therefore there could be no beneficial *προσέλευσις* to the true *Peculium*. Much more did the necessity of communicating with the *Son* oblige all to a *Communion* with the *Apostles*, as they were the *αὐτόπται*, the greatest *Favourites*, admitted to the nearest degrees of *Familiarity*, and the *secretest* of the *Son's Mysteries*; as they were the *ὑπηρεταὶ τῷ Λόγῳ*, attending him in his *Preaching*; as they were the *authoriz'd* most *Authentic* credible *Witnesses*, design'd by himself for that very purpose of being *Witnesses* of what was said and done by him; and as the *Cup of Blessing* blessed by the *Apostles* was a *κοινωνία* of the *Blood of Christ*, and the *Bread* broken by them was a *κοινωνία* of the *Body of Christ*, 1 Cor. x. 16. as it was drinking of the *Cup* of the *Lord* in Opposition to the *Cup of Devils*, and a partaking of the *Table* of the *Lord* in Opposition to the *Table of Devils*, v. 21. Thus it oblig'd all *Gentiles*, upon quitting their *Gentile Communion* with *Devils*, to join themselves immediately to the *external Communion* with

with the *Apostles* in order to their *Communion* with the *Lord* in *Opposition* to their old *Communion* with *Devils*. And the same *reasoning* holds in *Opposition* to all *subdividing Communion*s under the common Name of *Christianity*, whether *Heretical* or *Schismatical*. The *Body* of the *Church* after the *Apostles* was the same *Body* that had been under the *Apostles*, only *continu'd* under the *Lives* of *Survivers*. There could not therefore be any *communicating* with the *Apostles* in any later *Age*, but by *communicating* with that *Body* which had deriv'd the *Succession* to the *Age* of the *Communicant*. That *common Body* was alone intitled to all the *Rights* and *Privileges* it had been invested with in any *Age*. But more particularly with those *Privileges* which were design'd *Ordinary* for all *Church-Members* in all succeeding *Ages*, as this most certainly, was of the *Mystical Communion* with the *Father* and the *Son*. That appears from the form of *Baptism* of perpetual use in all *Ages*, in the *Name* of all the *Persons* of the *Trinity*, plainly implying that *baptized Persons* are all of them admitted to *Communion* with the *Father* and the

Parænes.
§. 29.

San; and from the whole *Discipline* of the *Church* in this Age also, wholly depending on the *Ratification* in *Heaven* of the Sentences pronounc'd by the *visible Bishop* on *Earth*. The *Terror* of these *Earthly Sentences* was thence deriv'd that *God* and *Christ*, as represented and oblig'd by the *visible earthly Bishop*, were thought oblig'd to exclude him from the *Heavenly Communion*, whom the *visible Bishop* had excluded from his own *Communion* on *Earth*, as I have elsewhere shewn. The Article also of the *Communion* of *Saints* was to assert the *Concurrence* between the *visible* and the *mystical Church* under the *Presidency* of *God* and *Christ*, as a *Point of Faith*, and of the greatest Importance to our *Christian Society*. To the same purpose is *Christ's Promise* of being with his *Church* to the end of the *World*, even where two or three are gather'd together in his *Name*. Which can be understood of no other than the *visible Assemblies* of the *Church* in this *World*, and his own express *Doctrine* of the inseparable *Union* between himself and his *Father*, when he was desired by his *Disciples* to shew them his *Father*. To which I might add the
many

many other Scriptures which mention it as a Privilege of the new *Peculium*, that we should be all taught of God; that Christ would be Emanuel, God with us; that we are to be all one, as the Father is in Christ, and Christ in his Father; that we also may be one in them, Christ in us, and his Father in him, that we may be made perfect in one, John xvii. 21, 23. that they might walk in us, and dwell in us, and that we might be their Temples. These are certainly the Ordinary lasting Favours of the new *Peculium*, not to determine with any one Age, much less with that of the Apostles. It is very ill Reasoning, to make the Mystical Benefits of Communion in the Apostles Age temporary, because the Evidences and Manifestations were so. Those Manifestations were requisite at first to prove the Donations true to the first Converts to our Christian Religion, which were afterwards to be expected to be believ'd by their Successors, on Account of our Lord's general Promise of seconding his own Institutions without any new repeated Manifestations. The Holy Ghost was given at first to the Apostles and their first Converts in flaming Tongues, and

such other *sensible Evidences*. We must not therefore believe that he is not *now* also given in our Saviour's *Baptism*, whose *Prerogative* it was to give the *Baptism* of the *Spirit*, because we have not *now* those *visible Evidences* of his being given as were frequent *then*. On the contrary the Scripture supposes all *baptiz'd Persons* to have the *Spirit*, and that whoever *has not the Spirit of Christ is none of his*. The like *Evidences* there were *then* of the *Power* the *Evil Spirits* had over them who were *deliver'd to Satan* by Ecclesiastical Censures. These are not *now* so frequent. Yet we must not therefore disbelieve, that God does *still* make use of those ordinary *Ministers* of his *Inflictions* on Sinners, in the Case of *Excommunicates*, because we have not *now* so many *Proofs* of it in *this Life*, as they had *then*. *Sacrilege* is still as *Criminal*, and as liable to a severe Punishment as in the Case of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, though we do not *now* see sacrilegious Persons always punish'd by such a present and immediate Interposition of *Heaven*. So is the Case of *unworthy Communicants*, though we have not so many *weak* and *sickly*, and *capitally* punish'd

as

as in *that Age* of the more Ordinary use of *Extraordinaries*. But as the *new Peculium* is a Constitution principally design'd for the *future State*, this newly reveal'd *Communion* with the *Father* and the *Son* is most certainly ingredient in it. These *Principles* are impossible to be reconcil'd with a *diversity* of *Communions*, one *stated*, and the other only *occasional*. Our dealing here is with *God*, who is pleas'd to concern *himself* in the *Affronts* offer'd to Persons *authoriz'd* by *him*. Not with *Men*, but *God*. So the sacred Writers usually express it in this very Case, where the dealing was notwithstanding *immediately* with *Men*. To let us know that, as *God* is pleas'd thus to *interpret* it, so he will *punish* it, not according to the Dignity of the *Person* of his *Representative*, but his *own*. And he is one who will not be serv'd by *halves*, who requires *all* our *Heart*, and *all* our *Soul*, and *all* our *Mind*, and *all* our *Strength*; who will have the whole *Heart*, or *none*; who endures no *Rival*, who has declar'd against *halting* between two *Opinions*, between *himself* and *Belial*, and against all *Laodicean Lukewarmness*. These are the *Principles* of the *New Testa-*

Acts v. 4.

Testament. Let our Adversaries reconcile them with their own Case of *occasional Communion* if they can.

XIX.
St. John's
whole Reasoning
supposes
them in
Communion with
the Devil,
who are
out of the
true Communion.

St. John goes further, and describes the Case of the two *Communion*s he there disputes of as such as admitted no Thoughts of *Indifferency*. He mentions the *Benefits* of the *Mystical Communion*, as common to all them who, by preferring the *Communion* with *himself* and his Collegue *Apostles*, had secur'd themselves of their *Communion* with the *Father* and the *Son*. Those he calls *Life*, and *Light*, and *Truth*. And the contrary he supposes to be the Case of them who were in any other *opposite Communion*, that they (for that very reason of their being of any *other* than the *Orthodox Communion*) were in a State of *Death* in Opposition to *Life*, of *Darkness* in Opposition to *Light*, of *Falseness* and *Error* in Opposition to the *Truth*. These Characters our Adversaries can never reconcile with a *Salvable Condition* by the *Principles* of the *New Testament*. The State of *Death* here mention'd must necessarily relate to the *second Death*, not the *first*, which those of the *true Communion* are as liable to as they of the *false* ones. It must

must therefore mean such a Disposition in *this Life* as must deprive the Persons, involved in it, of all *Title* to that *better Life* which is expected hereafter. The Original of the Form of Speaking was, I believe, deriv'd from the *Pythagoreans*, who very much influenc'd the *Jewish Essenes*, as the *Essenes* seem to have done the *Christians* by a Coalition of their whole *Body* with our Ancestors: For we find very few Footsteps of them after the first *beginnings* of *Christianity*. Those *Philosophers* erected *Monuments* for the *Divulgers* of their *Philosophical Mysteries*, as Persons destitute of all Hopes of that *Diviner Life* which was promis'd by their *Mysteries*. Our *Sacred Writings* of the *New Testament* imitate the same Style. So our Saviour, when he warns that the *dead* should *bury their dead*. So the Apostle, when he mentions the *dead in Trespasses and Sins*. And when he says concerning the *Widow* that *lives in Pleasures*, that *she was dead while she lived*. The State of *Death* therefore in this Sense can be no other than a State of *Damnation*, if it be not repented of, and therefore cannot be a State of *justifiable Communion*, so much
as

as *Occasional*. Nor is the other Term of *Darkness* of any better Importance for our Adversaries purpose. That is always describ'd in the *New Testament* as an *initial Hell*, and a State of *Subjection* to the *Devil*. He is the *Prince of Darkness*, and his *Powers* are the *Powers of Darkness*. And *Sins*, as they serve his Interests, are call'd the *unfruitful Works of Darkness*. So in the *Scriptures*, and so in the *Apostle Barnabas*. *Occasional Communion* therefore with those who are in *Darkness* is, by the *Scripture Principles*, interpreted to be *Communion* with the *Devil* himself. But both *he* and his *Works of Darkness* are made *uncapable* of *Christian Communion*. What *Communion* hath *Light* with *Darkness*? And what *Concord* hath *Christ* with *Belial*? 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15. Have no *Fellowship* with the *unfruitful Works of Darkness*, Eph. v. 11. Μὴ συγχωρονεῖτε is the Word, by which the Reader may understand that what is here, and elsewhere, translated *Fellowship* is indeed *Communion*. So also, in the Third Particular, that which is oppos'd to the πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας is the πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης, 1 Joh. iv. 6. These πνεύματα πλάνης are join'd with the διδασκαλία

ἀγαθὰ δαίμονίων, 1 Tim. iv. 1. and therefore can be no other than *evil Spirits*, with whom our Adversaries themselves will not, I believe, allow any *Communion* whatsoever, even not so much as *occasional*.

I do not doubt but that the Severity of these Inferences will very much surprize our *Latitudinarian* Adversaries: And I wish, for the sake of my *deceased* Friends, (who are *concerned* in the *Consequence*, yet have given no sensible Signification of their *Repentance*, that might give ground for a prudent *Charity*) that any of my *living* Friends could apologize for their Case better than I can. But if *God* has been pleased to *oblige* all Men to his own *Constitutions*, and a Submission to his *authorized Representatives* on *Earth* under pain of reckoning them, in case of their *Refractoriness*, as *Subjects* of the *Devil*, and giving them over to his *Power* whom they have rather chosen to serve: It is not our *Favour* to Mens *Persons*, it is not any *good Meaning* on the part of those who are guilty of this *Refractoriness*, that can change the *Divine Establishments*, or the *Consequences* that must flow from them. If a *Marcus Antoninus*, or an *Epictetus*,
sacri-

sacrifices to a *Heathen Idol*, he *sacrifices* to a *Devil*, and *communicates* with a *Devil*, by the Doctrine of *Christianity* in our *inspired Writings*, how good an *Opinion* soever *himself* has of the *God* he worships, and how far soever he may be from *designing* any Honour thereby to any *wicked* or *unclean Spirits*. So we have Reason to believe *God* will *interpret* such a *Sacrifice*, by the surest way we have of knowing *God's Mind*, by his *own Declaration* of it in the *Scriptures*. And it would become every truly pious *conscientious* Person, rather to *secure* his own Soul by a meek and resigned *Compliance* with the *Divine Constitutions* in his *Practice*, than to *murmur* with the *unfaithful Servant*, and to *reproach* *God* with the Imputation of being a *hard Master*, for his having *made* such *Constitutions*. Those very excellent *Heathens*, now mention'd, had a great Honour for the *Supreme Being*, as appears from their Works still extant, and undoubtably never *intended* their *publick* Worship for any that *themselves* believed *evil* ones. The *Dei dæmones* *idæw* were they for whom their publick Solemnities were all *intended*: The *infernal Gods* that were worshipped for
Fear

Fear rather than Love, and their A-
 verruncations and ἀποτεγνιασμοί, were
 generally deserted by the Heathens
 themselves, as also the immoral Bac-
 chanalia, and the Rites of Cybele and
 the like, at this time when God was
 pleased to publish the Gospel by the
 Ministry of the Apostles. And the
 Persons concerned in such Worship, the
 Magi and Venefici, and the Galli
 and θυγαῶροι were publicly infam-
 ous, and under the publick Censures
 of their Laws made by those heathen
 Governors themselves. Yet the Scri-
 ptures and the first Christians judg'd
 the Worship of the best of those Hea-
 then Deities to be no better than a
 Worship of Devils, and dealt with
 their lapsed Brethren who were guilty
 of it accordingly. And they gather'd
 it from such general Reasonings as make
 the Worship of all other Bodies distinct
 from that of the true Peculium to be
 a Worship of Devils. I have elsewhere
 observ'd that Passage of the Apostoli-
 cal Ignatius, where he makes all Acts
 of Assemblies separate from Bishops to
 be a Worship of the Devil. Ὁ λαΐτεξ
 ἐπισκόπῃς τὶ πρῶτων, τῷ διαβόλῳ λατρεύ-
 ον. I know not whether Mr. Calamy
 had this Place in his View when he
 took

Of Mar-
 riage out
 of the Pe-
 culium.

Ep. ad
 Smyr. §. 9.

Against
Mr. Head-
ly, Part I.
p. 151, 152.

took upon him to censure this holy Person as *out of his Wits* and *blasphemous*. Nor can I but wonder at his *Confidence* in pretending to know the *Apostles Minds* (from *Writings* of those *Times* wherein it is *not* likely that they had taken any care for settling *that* Constitution of the *Church* which was designed for the Use of *Posterity*, upon the *failing* of those *Gifts* and *Offices* that were *extraordinary*) better than *Ignatius* who *convers'd* with the *Apostles*, and that in those *later Times* wherein they were most *oblig'd* to *settle* the *ordinary Government* of the *Church*, which could not *fully* take place *'till* the *Expiration* of their *own Lives*. Yet on the other side, this *Passage* is so decisive against his *Case*, and that of his *Latitudinarian Brethren*, that it was very likely to raise the unmortify'd *Passion* of such as were not willing to *receive the Truth in the love of it*. The *Acts* the *Blessed Martyr* speaks of here under the general term of *πράξεις* are *Baptism* and the *Eucharist*, and the *Apostolical Feasts of Agapæ*, and in general the *τὰ εὐχέλεια εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*, as appears in the *Words* foregoing. These were *λατρίαι*, and design'd for the one true
 God

God of the *true Peculium*. Yet upon God's declaring his *not accepting* them when performed in *Dis honour* of his own *Authoriz'd Representatives*, he declares them *Acts of Worship* not of *him* for whom they were intended, but of his Rival the *Devil*, who had indeed the *Benefit* of all that *Worship* which was declared *unacceptable* to the *true God*.

Nor can he, and his Brethren, think this so *different* from the *Doctrine* of the *Scriptures*, if they will be pleas'd to consider the *Scriptures* themselves sedately, and without any regard to imbibed Prejudices. The *Jews* themselves (how much *Zeal* soever they pretended for the *Law* of God) yet are taken by St. *John* for the *Synagogue of Satan*. I know the *Blasphemy* of them which say they are *Jews*, and are not, but are the *Synagogue of Satan*, Rev. ii. 9. Again; Behold, I will make them of the *Synagogue of Satan*, (which say, they are *Jews*, and are not, but do lie) behold I will make them to come and worship before thy Feet, and to know that I have lov'd thee, iii. 9. There could hardly be any, at this time, who could find in their Hearts to pretend to be

K

Jews,

XXI.

So the
Jews also,
after their
Breach of
Communion
with
the Christi-
ans, are
called the
Synagogue
of Satan.

Sueton.
Domitian.

Jews, if they were *not*, but they who *glory'd* in that *Name*. Nor were any likely to *glory* in that *Name* but they who were *Jews* by *Extraction*, when the very *Name* expos'd them to a *Tax* to the *Temple of Peace* at *Rome*, the same which had formerly been paid to their own *Temple* at *Jerusalem*, which *Tax* was exacted with great *Rigor* in this *Reign of Domitian*, under whom *St. John* receiv'd his *Revelations* in his *Exile* at *Patmos*, when withal they had not only incens'd their *Roman* *Protectors* against them by that *Rebellion* which *God* was pleas'd to make the *occasion* of inflicting the *Vengeance* themselves had imprecated upon their own *Heads*, but thereby expos'd themselves *defenceless* to the old *Rancors* and *Resentments* of their neighbouring *Nations*, who took this occasion, as *Josephus* shews, under pretence (no doubt) of gratifying the *Romans*, to wreck the utmost of their own *Malice* against them. At such a time, I say, as this was, they could have been no other but *Jews* by *Extraction* that could shew themselves so zealously *ambitious* of so *hateful* a *Name*, which had nothing to recommend it but the *Glory* of their *Ancestors*. Yet neither
was

was that any *Recommendation* to any but *themselves* and the *Christians*. But how then could they who were really *Jews* by *Extraction* be said to *lie* in challenging that *Name*, and not to be what they pretended? This will be easily accountable if we remember, that, in the Disputes between *them* and the *Christians*, the *Christians*, even the *Gentile uncircumcis'd* Converts, challenged all those *Names of Glory* to themselves, and *deny'd* them to the *unbelieving Jews*, as far as they did indeed afford matter of *true Glory*. They deny'd *them* to be *all Israel who were of Israel*, *Rom. ix. 6*. Their meaning was plainly this, that all that were of *Israelitish Extraction* were not of the *Israelitish Seed* which was intitled to the *Patriarchal Promises*, and that the *uncircumcis'd Gentile* Proselytes to *Christianity* had a better *Right* to this *Name* of the *privileg'd Israel* than those who *glory'd* only in their *Carnal Ancestors*. To this end *St. Paul* shews that it was not the *Israel after the Flesh*, *1 Cor. x. 18*. for whom the *Promises* were intended; not the *Seed of Abraham's Flesh*, but of his *Faith*, *Rom. ix. 8*. which *Faith* he had whilst he was himself yet *uncircumcis'd*,

Rom. iv. 2. Here the *believing Gentiles* had a better Plea to be the *Seed of Abraham*, for whom the *Promises* were intended, than the *Jews* had, because he also was *uncircumcis'd* as well as they, when the *Promises* were made to him and his *Seed*, and when his *Faith* was *imputed to him for Righteousness*. Accordingly the *Apostle* distinguishes further, of two sorts of *Circumcision* mention'd in the *Old Testament*; that of the *Flesh* and the *Letter*, which *Abraham* himself had not when the *Promise* was made to him, and which therefore could not have been design'd for the *Beneficial Circumcision*; and that of the *Spirit*, to which the *Pious believing Gentiles* could lay a better Claim than the *unbelieving Jews* themselves. He therefore distinguishes also between Two sorts of *Jews*, one that is so *outwardly*, by the *Circumcision which is outward in the Flesh*; the other that is so *inwardly*, whose *Circumcision is that of the Heart, in the Spirit, and not in the letter*. This is he of whom he says, *whose Praise is not of Men, but of God*, *Rom. ii. 28, 29*. The *Mystical Jew* therefore, by this Doctrine, is the *only Jew* who is *prais'd* for such

such by *God*, who judges not by *outward appearance*, 1 Sam. xvi. 7. He therefore is the only *true Jew*, the other only so in *appearance*, not in *reality*. This *Reasoning* is perfectly agreeable to the other *Mystical Platonical Reasonings* of the *New Testament*, which allow the Name of *Truth* only to the *Mystical Archetypal Exemplars*, not to the *Ectypals*, as I have elsewhere observ'd. This gives us a clear Account, from the *Reasonings* and *Principles* of the *New Testament*, why *St. John* denies them to be *Jews* who notwithstanding were indeed *Jews* by *Extraction*, and why he says they *lie* when they pretended to be *Jews*. But they, who *boasted* so of their *Extraction*, could hardly possibly be guilty of the *Heathen Idolatry*, nor consequently of *worshipping* the same *Devils* with the *Heathens*, whom themselves *condemn'd* as well as the *Christians*. The *Glory* of that *Name* was thence deriv'd, that that *Nation* alone had been formerly the peculiar *Favourites* of the *Supream Being*, who had been pleas'd to take them into his immediate Care, whereas he had committed other Nations to the Government of other *subordinate Spirits*, as

I have shewn in my *One Priesthood and one Altar*. But it had been a *quitting* of this peculiar *Glory* of the *Jews* above all other *Nations* in the *World*, for any *Jew* to worship any *Local* or *National* God. That had been a reducing himself by his own Act to an *Equality* with other *Nations*, and *inconsistent* with the *National Privileges* of the *Jews* suppos'd by them who *boasted* of their being of that *Nation*. Whoever therefore debased himself thus far could have no great Opinion of that great *Glory* of his own *Nation*. And he that had not such an Opinion was by no means likely so to *boast* of it, as we find *they* did of whom *St. John* was speaking in this Place. Plainly therefore they were *Jews* by *Extraction*, and such as design'd their *Worship* for that *Supream Being* of whom they so *boasted*. The Name of a *Synagogue* supposes them so, when they had now no other *publick Worship* but in their *Synagogues* after the *Desolation* of their *Temple*. So also do their mentioned *Blasphemies* against the *Christians*, of which we have so many Instances, even in the *Scripture History*. Why then are they call'd the *Synagogue of Satan*? I know no other

other Reason that can be given besides that *general* one of their being *divided* from the *true Peculium*, the *true Jews*, and the *true Israelites*. Here therefore we have a *Scripture* Example exactly parallel with that of *Ignatius*, of judging them in the *Communion* of the *Devil* who were *divided* from the *true Communion*, the *Privilege* of whom alone it was to be in *Communion* with the *Father* and the *Son*. And if this were the Case of the *old Peculium* it self as soon as they had *separated* themselves from the *true Communion*, much more it must have been of *Christian Separatists*. So the *Apostle* supposes in his *Reasonings* concerning the *natural* and *engrafted Branches* of the *Olive*; *If God spar'd not the natural Branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee*, Rom. xi. 21. The stile of the same sacred Writer elsewhere is the same: *The Devil shall cast some of you into Prison*, Rev. ii. 10. This immediately follows the mention of the *Synagogue* of *Satan*. And therefore, in all likelihood, is meant of the same *Synagogue*. To the same purpose he mentions *Satan's Seat*; *Sebvuv*, in *Pergamus*, where *Satan dwell'd*, v. 13. meaning perhaps the *consistorial Judicatories* allow'd to the

Jews in some places by the Indulgence of their Conquerors the *Romans*, which might enable them to *Persecute* the *Christians*, or the *insidious Practices* of the *Hereticks* as *false Brethren*, who did not yet profess open *Hostility* whilst they were over-aw'd by the *Reverence* they had for the yet surviving *Apostles*. However as many as appear'd to *divide* from the *Communion* of the *Church* in that *Age* are treated in the same way. *St. Polycarp* calls *Marcion* the *First-born of the Devil*. *St. John*, *Cerintus* the *Enemy of God*. *St. Paul*, *Elymas* the *Sorcerer a Child of the Devil*, and their *Doctrines*, *Doctrines of Devils*. He tells us that the coming of his *Man of Sin* (by whom, in all likelihood, he means those *Apostates* from the *Communion*) was to be *after the working of Satan*, 2 *Thess.* ii. 9. *κατ' ἐνεργειαν*, as an *Energumenus*, a Person possess'd by the *Devil*. He tells us also, that the *God of this World* had blinded the *Minds* of them who believ'd not, 2 *Cor.* iv. 4. Who can doubt but that he means here the *Devil*? The same whom he elsewhere calls the *Ruler of the Darkness of this World*, *Eph.* iv. 12. The same under whom he supposes all to be before their *Reception* into the *true Communion*,
Wherein

Wherein in time past ye walked according to the Course of this World, according to the Prince of the Power of the Air, the Spirit that now worketh [again ἐνεργεῖ] in the Children of Disobedience, among whom also we all had our Conversation in times past, in the Lusts of our Flesh, fulfilling the Desires of the Flesh, and of the Mind, and were by Nature the Children of Wrath, even as others, Eph. ii. 23. Hence we see how Excommunication was understood to be a Delivery unto Satan. It was a putting them into the Condition of Heathens and Publicans, a putting them into the same Condition wherein they were before they were admitted into the Church, which is here plainly suppos'd to be in the Power of the Devil. This was plainly suppos'd in the whole Discipline of the Church as it was practic'd in those first and purest Times.

The best Liver that was, before his Conversion to the Christian Religion, was so treated at his Reception into the Christian Communion as one that was actually under the Power of the Devil. He was to renounce the Devil, ἀποτάσσειν, the same time that he was to profess his συνταξιν with Christ.

XXII.
The Discipline of the Church, in the purest Times, suppos'd, even the best moral Liv-ers, when out of the true Communion, & under the Power of the Devil.

The

The Terms were *Military*, and alluded to the *Defection* from one *Hostile Army* to another, and therefore suppos'd him of the *Devil's Army*, and under his *Command*, before he join'd himself to his *Lawful Prince*. He was also to be *exorcis'd*, as well as the *Christian Energumeni*, which plainly suppos'd all such *Profelytes* as much *possess'd* by the *Devil*, as the *Lapsers* from their *Baptismal Purity* by *peculiar Crimes*. He was to be *purify'd* by his *Water-Baptism* not only from the *Guilt* of his *Original Sin*, and his *actual Sins* committed *formerly*, but also from the *Impurity* contracted by the *Inhabitation* of so *impure a Spirit*. This was, in Truth, the *Impurity* that hinder'd the *Members* of the *Church* from *communicating* with him in any *Holy Offices* of *Prayer* before his *Baptism*, from which his *Sins* committed *after Baptism* did not exclude him, unless they were so great as to *exclude* him by a *Censure* of his *Ecclesiastical Superiors*. Nor was he thought *qualify'd* for receiving the *Mystical Baptism* of the *good Spirit*, (which was the *Bond* that *incorporated* him into the *Mystical Body* of *Christ*, his *Church*) 'till he had past through all these pre-
VIOUS

vious *Lustrations*. Thus it was in the *first* Admission of any *Member* into the *Church*, how exemplary soever his *Morals* had been *before* his *Admission*. That was not thought sufficient to free him from *Slavery* to the *Devil* 'till *Christ* was pleas'd to *redeem*, and *manumit* him, and to apply the *price* of his *Redemption* to him by *incorporating* him into his *Mystical Body*. The same was thought to be the Condition of *Excommunicates* and *Separatists*, that the *Separation*, whether *active* or *passive*, did put them into the same Condition they were in *before* their *Admission*, and therefore into the same *Subjection* to the *Devil* as *before*. Immediately therefore on their *Division* from the *Society* which was *privileg'd* with the *Protection* of good *Spirits*, the *evil Spirits* had a *Power* over them, which in that Age of *Extraordinaries* (wherein things were to be *prov'd* which were afterwards to be *believ'd* on the *Credit* of the *Proofs* then given in that *first* Age) appear'd by *sensible Manifestations*. Yet God was pleas'd to *confine* the malignity of those *Evil Spirits*, who had *Power* over them, to such Acts of *Cruelty* as might serve the ends of *Discipline* in his

his *own Church*, to terrifie others by their Example, and to dispose the Criminals *themselves* to such a *Repentance* as might qualifie them for the *Favour* of their *Spiritual Superiors* in order to a new *Reception*. This Punishment therefore was for the *Destruction of the Flesh*, with that merciful Design, that the Spirit might be sav'd in the *Day of the Lord Jesus*, 1 Cor. v. 5. This was especially the Case of such whose *Separation* was *involuntary*, and occasion'd by *Carnal Frailty*; for *voluntary Separatists* their Case was look'd on as *more desperate*, both in regard of their *Repentance*, and their *Acceptance* also, as I have elsewhere shewn from *Ebr.* vi. 4, 5, 6. x. 26, 27. And therefore such, if they had not these *monitory Chastisements* of the Devil in *this Life*, it was far from being a *Privilege* or *Favour* to them. It look'd like a *Consignation* of them to receive their Punishment *hereafter*. Letting Sinners *alone* is the most dreadful Punishment in *this Life*. And it is intended by God as an *Argument*, that he does *not* utterly take away his *loving Kindness* from those, whose *Transgressions* he visits with the *Rod*, and their *Iniquity* with *Scourges*,
 Psal.

Pfal. lxxxix. 32, 33. The Devil was suppos'd to have them more securely for his *own* when he was in less Danger of losing them by *castigatory* In-flictions.

However the Reasoning of the Scriptures in this Case is so clear that I know not how it can be avoided. Those Holy Writings own no mean between *Light* and *Darkness*, between *Christ* and *Belial*, between him that believeth and an *Infidel*. And therefore whosoever is not of the *one* sort, must, for that very Reason, be concluded to belong to the *other*. The Scripture judges whether of these Parties we belong to by *External Acts*, by the *External Bodies* to which we are associated, and by *External Acts* of *Communion*. It is impossible to serve *God* and *Mammon*, and he that is not with *Christ* is against him, and therefore must be reckon'd belonging to his Adversary *Mammon*. He owns no *Body* of *Men* for his but his *Church*, nor any *Church* for his but that which is in *Covenant* with him by *Baptism* and our *Eucharistical Sacrifice*. They are in *Communion* with our *Lord* who partake of the *Table* of the *Lord*, and they who do not partake at that *Table* are

XXIII.
The Reasonings of the Scriptures own no mean between being in the Communion of the Church, and under the Power of the Devil.

are for that Reason judg'd to *commu-
nicate* with the *Devil* whatever *other
Table* they *communicate* with, though
they have nothing to do with *Idol Sa-
crifices*. They can have no *Communi-
on* with *Christ* who have it not with
his *Authoriz'd Representatives*. So
he tells us expressly; *He that despiseth
you, despiseth me, and he that despis-
eth me despiseth him that sent me,*
Such a Person therefore cannot have
the *Mystical Communion* with the *Fa-
ther* nor the *Son*, and therefore must,
by *St. John's Reasoning*, be in *Dark-
ness*, and *Death*, and *Error*, and sub-
ject to that *Spirit of Error* which he
has chosen for his own *Guide*. So he
is by *Christ's own Interpretation*, how
firmly soever he pretends to *believe
Christ*. There is also another Division
of *Mankind*, in the *Scriptures*, by
which it appears that all *Mankind*,
who cannot prove their Title to *Christ*,
must necessarily belong unto the *Devil*.
Christ's Disciples are said not to be of
this World, as being *his* who is the
Prince of the World to come. So him-
self tells us; *Ye are not of the World,*
but I have chosen you out of the
World, *St. John xv. 19.* *They are*
not of the World, even as I am not of
the

the World, xvii. 14, 16. The Friendship of this World is Enmity with God. Whosoever therefore will be a Friend of the World, is the Enemy of God, St. Jam. iv. 4. It here appears that there is no Neutrality, when all who are of that Body which the Scripture calls the World, are, for that very Cause, denounc'd Enemies. So St. John also, If any Man love the World, the Love of the Father is not in him, 1 St. John ii. 15. Forsaking of the true Church is loving this present World. So St. Paul; Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present World, 2 Tim. iv. 10. That is a general Term, and comprehends all visible Bodies whatsoever distinct from that of the Privileg'd Society, and is plainly meant not of the Place, but the State. Being out of the Church therefore is being in a State of Hostility. It is a reversing the Baptismal Renunciation of the Devil as our General and Commander. It is a returning to his Camp, and renouncing the Camp of Christ. And therefore must as properly make such Apostates Subjects of the Devil, as the Baptismal Renunciation of the Devil had made them Subjects of Christ. This is more properly

ly true of this joining the *World* as an *opposite Body* than of *immoderate Love* of *worldly Enjoyments* in Persons *continuing* in the *true Communion*. Subjects, though they *break* the *Laws*, and make themselves thereby liable to *Legal Punishments*, are notwithstanding not treated as *Enemies*, whilst they *own* the *Authority*, and profess no *open* Opposition to the *Laws* of the *Society*. And their *Treatment*, whilst they proceed no *further*, is very different from what they may expect when they make an *open Defection* to a *Hostile Body*. Such Faults of *Subjects* continuing in their *Duty* are rather *chastiz'd* than *punish'd* by mild and merciful *Governors*, with a *Prospect* on the *good* of the *Individuals*, (where there is any reason to *hope* it) as well as of the *Publick*. But *Enemies* are more severely dealt with. They are to be *broken* before they are admitted to any *hopes* of *Mercy*, and to be *disabled* to do harm before they are *trusted* with their own *Liberty*. This *Hostility* therefore must be of such a *Love* of the *World* as that of *Demas*, which made the Persons who were guilty of it *forsake* the *true Communion*. So it will best fit the Design
of

L

those

those of the *true Communion*; but by *possessing* them and *dwelling* in them, as the *Father, Son* and *Spirit* were suppos'd to do in the *true Peculium*. This *Inhabitation* made them *unclean*, and unfit for *Communion* with *good* and *pure Spirits*. So even the *Heathens* also judg'd in the case of the *Furies* and *Eumenides* who were suppos'd to inhabit *Piacular Persons*. These they also accounted *unclean* in comparison of those *Gods* who were the *Objects* of their ordinary *Adorations*. Nor would they admit such *Persons*, 'till they were *expiated*, to partake in their *publick Sacrifices*, nor *solemn Prayers*. Exactly as the *Christians* treated their own *Energumens*, who were not *utterly* excluded from their *own*, as not being engag'd in any *opposite Communion*, and as the *Jews* did those of their own *Nation* who were under *Legal Pollutions*, which were not properly *Sins*. But this *Pollution* was much greater in those who were engag'd in *opposite Communions*. A *Defection* from God's *Vice-gerent* was a *voluntary* lifting themselves under the *Commander* in Chief of all God's *Enemies*. And as many *Acts of Communion* as were exercis'd in a *false Communion*

munion would add so many new *Legitimations* of the *Evil Spirits Possession* by the *Communicant's* Consent. For those Acts of *Communion* not warranted by *God* could not give the *good Spirit*, but being under the *Mystical Headship* of the *Evil Spirit* must confirm his Title when they were a *λειτουργία* to the *Devil*, as well as the *partaking* of the *Heathen Sacrifices* is own'd to do so by *St. Paul*. They must necessarily have the same *pactional Consequences* in dealing with the *Evil Spirit* out of the *true Communion* as they would have had with the *good Spirit* in the *true Communion*. This Doctrine must necessarily destroy all *occasional Communion*. For none can think it lawful at all to *communicate* with *Evil Spirits*, so much as *occasionally*, much less *statedly*.

As for the *Doctrine* it self, how much soever it may surprize our *Adversaries*, I know not how they can possibly avoid it. Themselves grant the Doctrine of *Original Sin*, and believe it to be not only the sense of the *Primitive Catholick Church*, but of the *Scriptures* also truly interpreted. Yet what I have said is only a just *Consequence* from *that Doctrine* as it

XXIV.
All Man-kind en-slav'd to the Devil by Original Sin, not delivered from that Slavery but by Christ, who has purchased that Deliverance only for his Elect, as a visible Body.

was *then* believ'd. By the *Fall* of *Adam* *Mankind* was *conquer'd* by the *Devil*, and by the *Law* of *Conquest*, his *Slaves*. All Men therefore in their *lapsed* Condition, are under the *Dominion* of the *Devil*. I think I need not produce *Scripture* for this which even themselves will not deny. How then can any be *sav'd* from this *Slavery* but by *Christ*? Neither will they doubt of this. If so, then all must *continue* in the same *Slavery* who are *not* deliver'd from it by *him*; and they who either do not *come* to him, or *leave* him, cannot pretend to be *deliver'd* by *him*, whom they either never *accepted*, or *deserted*. Our *Calvinistical* Adversaries *confine* our Blessed Saviour's *Deliverance*, to his *Elect*. Very well, if they had understood who those *Elect* were. They did not observe that *ἐκλεκτὸν* was one of the Appellations of the *old Peculium*, and from *them* deriv'd to the *new*. Had they observ'd that, they would then have understood that it belong'd to the *whole* visible *Body* of the *new Peculium*, and is *confin'd* to it. If *any* of this *Body* fail it is their own fault because they do not *make their Calling and Election sure*, 2 Pct. i. 10.

That

That very place shews that this *Electi-*
on is no more *secure*, without *Dili-*
gence, than their *Calling*. And this
 Notion agrees far better with the use
 of the Word in that Age than that
 modern one which has been mistaken
 for it in the Reasonings of *later* Ages.
 This is an easie and obvious Sense,
 and easily applicable to Particulars,
 whereas the other cannot possibly be
 apply'd to any *Particular* without *Di-*
vine Revelation. And if it ever be
 apply'd, it must be with great Disadvan-
 tage and Uncertainty, when the *Num-*
bers of the *Elect* are judg'd so ex-
 tremely disproportionable in compari-
 son of those who are not so. But
 contrariwise *whole Churches* are salu-
 ted as *Elect* in the Inscriptions of *E-*
pistles in the Age of the *Apostles*,
 which is exactly true in the *ancient*
 Sense I am speaking of, but not in
 the *modern* one. By this Sense all are
Elect who are in the *visible Church*,
 as well they that *fall* as they who *con-*
tinue in it. And none are *Elect* who
 are *not* of the *visible Church*, either
 in *Deed*, or in *Desire*. They cannot
 otherwise *prove* themselves to be of
 the Number of the *Elect* than as they
 can *prove* themselves to be in the *visi-*

ble Church. None can pretend to *Christ's Deliverance* but they whom he has *chosen* out of the rest of *Mankind* for **Candidates* for this *peculiar Favour*. Nor can they *prove* their own *Election* but as they can prove their being in his *visible Church* by living in Subjection to his *subordinate visible Governors*, and by their *communicating* in his *visible Sacraments*. If they be not *yet* in the *Church*, they are *yet* in their *Slavery*, as not being *yet deliver'd* out of it by him who alone can deliver them. If they have *renounc'd* all *Dependance* on the *visible Governors* of the *visible Church*, they can no longer pretend to be *Members* of *Christ's Church*, nor *Subjects* to the *Government* appointed by him. And by his *interpreting Affronts* to *them* as offer'd to *himself*, they are no longer under the *Government* of *Christ*. And having *quitted* his *Government*, they are then in the same Condition they were in *before* *Christ* was pleas'd to concern himself for them. From thence therefore they are again *Slaves* as formerly to their former Master, the *Devil*.

XXV.

However
Christ only
intended

However it is certain that what
Christ has done and suffer'd he design'd
only

only for his Church. And though he has not confin'd his Favour, as formerly, to *one Nation*, but has admitted all Mankind, both *genera singulorum* and *singula generum*, to a Capacity of this greatest Favour of all, of their Deliverance from their Slavery under the Devil; yet it is not otherwise, but under this Condition of their incorporating themselves into this Body to which he has confin'd his Favours. He prays not for the World, but for them which his Father had given him, St. John xvii. 9. So that he left the World, and those who will not leave the World in the Sense meant by the Scripture, in the same Condition in which he found them, still under the Dominion of their old Master. And he shews the utmost Extent of his Prayers, when he adds afterwards; *Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their Word*, v. 20. But on this Condition; *That they all may be one, as the Father is in him, and he in the Father, that they also may be one in the Father and the Son*, v. 21. This is parallel with what we observ'd from the same Apostle in his Catholick Epistle, where he urges External Com-

this Deliverance for all Men, on Condition of their becoming Members of his visible Church.

munion with each other under the Apostles as necessary to the Mystical Communion with the Father and the Son. So we are elsewhere told by St. Paul, that it is the Church of God which our blessed Saviour has purchased with his own Blood, Acts xx. 28. They therefore who deny the Lord that bought them, bringing on themselves swift Destruction, 2 St. Pet. ii. 1. were Members of the visible Church. They could not otherwise have been said to have been bought by Christ. And that they were so indeed appears from the foregoing Words; there shall be false Teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable Heresies. Their bringing in those Heresies privily implies their professing themselves openly of the true Communion. And thence it appear'd that Christ had bought them, because the Devil would not otherwise have quitted his Possession of them. So; who gave himself for our Sins, that he might deliver us from this present Evil World, Gal. i. 4. Christ lov'd us, and hath given himself for us, Eph. v. 2. Christ lov'd his Church, and gave himself for it, v. 25. Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all Iniquity,
and

and purifie unto himself a peculiar People, zealous of good Works, Tit. ii. 14. How much more shall the Blood of Christ (who, through the Eternal Spirit, offer'd himself without Spot to God) purge your Conscience from dead Works to serve the living God? Ebr. ix. 14. Christ also hath once suffer'd, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, 1 St. Pet. iii. 18. If we walk in the Light as he is in the Light, we have Fellowship [*κοινωνία*] one with another, and the Blood of Jesus cleanseth us from all Sin, 1 St. John i. 7. By these and the like Passages it appears that our Lord design'd all his delivering Performances for that Body of Men alone who were in Communion with the Apostles; for them and for those who should afterwards believe through their Word: That those alone are deliver'd from this present Evil World, which is subject to the Devil's Dominion: That those alone are redeem'd, the consequence whereof will be, that all others who are not redeem'd must still continue in their former Slavery: That those alone are purify'd, which must suppose the rest in an impure State, incapable of any Union of the pure Spirit, and perfectly at the Disposal

spofal of the *impure Spirit*: That their *Purity* alone from *dead Works* qualifies them to *serve the living God*, who before they receiv'd it could therefore only serve *him* whose *Dominion* is in *Hell* and *Death*, which are join'd together on this occasion: That it is *he* who brings us to God, plainly implying that they who are *not* so brought to God by *him* are *still* as much as ever in a State of *Alienation* as well from the *true God* as from the *true Peculium*, the *Common-wealth* of *Israel*: That this *walking in the Light* opposite to the contrary State of *Darkness*, of which the *Devil* is the *Prince*, is that which intitles us to *Communion one with another*, which must imply that they who are *not* in this *visible Communion* with *one another*, by being in the *Light*, must *still* be in the State of *Darkness*, and therefore in the contrary *Communion* with the *Devil*. I know very well the notorious *Schismatical Principles* and *Practices* of our *Adversaries* have oblig'd them in *Interest* to be so *partial* in this Cause of *Schism*, that they are unwilling to own the *Union* of the *Church* to consist in any thing *visible*, or capable of being determin'd in *this Life*. So conscious they

they are that, if it should prove to do so, it is impossible to defend their Cause from being liable to that Imputation. They therefore do in this Cause, as they do in that now mention'd, of *Election*. They make *Election* to consist in a *secret* immanent *Act* of God, impossible to be known by any particular Person concerning himself in *this Life*, without *Divine Revelation*. This makes the whole so *uncertain* here as that it is impossible to *reason* from it, for any *Duty* that cannot be perform'd but in *this Life*. The same Course they take in this Cause also relating to *Ecclesiastical Union*. They resolve that also into Proofs *impossible* to be determin'd *here*, for obliging all to a *Union* in *this Life*, which is to make it perfectly *useless* for that very Cause for which it was notwithstanding principally intended. They make it wholly *immediate* with *Christ* and his *Father*, and so wholly *independent* on *sensible Evidences*, that all the *manifestly divided* Parties may lay Claim to it, and that no *one* may have that Advantage over the rest, in *this Life*, as to be able, with any shew of Reason, to oblige all the rest to be of one Mind with it self. But it is manifest
that

156 *Against Occasional Communion.*

that all those *Reasonings* of the *Sacred Writings* themselves are design'd to recommend one *visible Communion* to all by whom they are used. But this they could never have done if the *Mystical Union* could have been expected without that which was *visible*, or if there had been any *other* way of *signifying* their *visible Union* to the Satisfaction of *themselves* or *others*, than by their *visible Communion* in the *Sacraments*. But these *Reasonings* plainly suppose all that are not in the *visible Communion* with the *Church*, to be *still* in the State to which they were reduc'd by *Adam's Fall*, of *subjection* to the *Devil*.

XXVI.
This is perfectly agreeable to the Sense of those Philosophers, whose Phraseology is principally us'd and alluded to in the Revelations of the New Testament, in this Manner.

And they are withal perfectly agreeable to the receiv'd Notion of those Times concerning the *Return* of the *Soul* from its *degenerous* State in *this World* to its *Original Happiness*. The very *Philosophers* had a Sense of this, those of them who came *nearest* to the Sense of the *Jews*, and who were of the best *Repute* with the *Jews*, and whose *Terms* are most made use of in the *Revelations* of the *New Testament* it self, which so far confirms what had been otherwise only *conjectural*, as it is attested by the *surer Word* of *Prophecy*.

phesy. And I do not intend to urge it any further. They thought the *Original State* of the *Soul* to have been *Cælestial*, and that by unlawful *Curiosity* for *Mysteries* not allow'd them by *God*, or by *Carnal Pollutions*, they *lost* those *Wings*, as they called them, of *ves*, with which they were invested *originally*, and by which they were *able* to *mount* above these *sublunary* *Regions* of the *Air*. That *inability* to *mount higher* confin'd them to *Matter*, and therefore within the *Districts* of the *Dæmon* ὕλης, who was suppos'd to have a *Power* allowed him by the *supream Being* over all that was properly *material*; for the *Moon* was reckon'd as the *last* and *lowest* of the *Cælestial Spheres*. And whatever was *lower* than *that* was accordingly reckon'd to the στοιχεῖα, 2 St. Pet. ii. 10. the *Elementary World*, including all the *Four Elements* which were all constituted of that *Matter* which was suppos'd to be the true *Original* of all the *Evil* that was, both *natural* and *moral*. Thus far therefore the *Dominions* of those *Spirits* who were appointed by the *supream Being* to be the *Authors* of all those *Changes* and *Vicissitudes*, to which *Matter* was naturally

turally thought obnoxious, was suppos'd to extend. Especially for those *Changes* which were intended for *punishing* the Criminal use of *Free-will* in the *reasonable* Inhabitants of this *lower World*. Hence it was that the *Witches* pretended to have a Power over the *Moon*, to bring it out of *Heaven* by their *Charms*, and their Influences over the *Devils* which *they*, and the *Magicians*, and the *Necromancers* were suppos'd to deal with. And the *Moon* her self was taken for the *Hecate triformis*, so famous among these infamous Persons, for her Power both in the lowest *Heaven* and in the *Air*, and those *Subterraneous* Regions in which the *Devil* was suppos'd principally to reside. And as *Adms* was begun from *hence*, so the *Chaos* and the *Darkness* that were allotted to these malignant *Spirits*. Accordingly *Hell* is subdivided into that which is called the *nethermost*, the Place of the *σκότος ἑσπεριον*, the *Tartarus*, where the *Darkness* was suppos'd more *pure* and *unmixt*, the Place of the *Titans* and *Giants*, (to speak in the Language of the *Heathens*) or of the *Devils*, in that of the *Scriptures* : Or into the *Darkness* of *this World*, including all
from

from the *Moon* to the *Earth* it self. This was also made the ordinary Residence of the *less faculent Spirits*, and occasionally of those which were *more faculent*, as Providence was pleas'd to loosen their *Chains of Dark-ness*, or to confine them, for the *Good* or the *Punishment* of Mankind. But this *upper Region* was taken for the *natural Place* of those *Demons* which were *Aerial* and *Terrestrial*, for the *Heroes* or *Simidei*, for the *ἡρώες* and *καταχθόνιοι*. And among them, for *Souls of Men*, as being also of a *middle Nature*, according to their different States, of greater or lesser Perfection. The *κατὰ* of *Souls*, where the *Plato-nists* suppos'd them fitted for their *Bodies*, was plac'd in the *Moon* it self. But the *Earth* was made the Place of the *Manes* which were confin'd there by the adscititious *Impurities* contracted by them, the *κῆρες*, the *Corporeæ pestes*, acquired by the ill use of their *Free-will*, when they had been formerly in *Bodies*. The return therefore of *Souls* from their *Exile* from their *Original Heavenly Station*, their *κάθο-δός*, they thought promoted by their *Mysteries* of both sorts; their *Cathar-tick* or *Purgative*, and their *Teleiotick*

or

or *Consummative*. The *Cathartick* were design'd to prepare them for the other, for *purg*ing them from the fore-mention'd contracted *Impurities*, which 'till they were *purg'd*, made them *incapable* of receiving the *greater* and *perfective* *Mysteries*. This *cleansed* the *Soul* from what they called the βέβροε, the *Mud*, in which the *Platonists* suppos'd *uninitiated Souls* to stick. And it was thought to be a particular Benefit of the *Initia* that they facilitated the Emerfion of the *Soul* from thefe *Corporeal Defilements*. This *Purgation* was eſpecially aſcrib'd to two Elements, *Fire* and *Water*. And the *Scriptures* own the uſe of *both* theſe *Elements* in *Purgation*, Num. xxxi. 23. Accordingly our *Chriſtian Baptiſm* is repreſented under the Names of both Elements, of *Fire* and *Water*. But the *great* *Mystery*, that which was *perfective*, was that which was thought to *renew* the *Wings* of the *Soul*, by reſtoring to it the *Divine Nature* of which it was poſſeſs'd *originally*, the Νῆς or the Λόγος, whoſe hearing the *Platonists* plac'd in the *Sun*. This, being join'd to the ψυχή, intituled that alſo to the Place of its own *Reſidence*, in *Heavenly Places* properly ſo call'd,
above

above the reach of ὕλη and the *Dæmon* which presided over it. That was sufficient to exempt the *Soul* (thus perfected by the Accession of a nobler Nature) from that *Dæmon* who could pretend no *Right* over those *Souls* which were not, by their Nature, confin'd within his *Jurisdiction*, but could mount above it as *Native* Inhabitants of *Heaven*, on account of that nobler *Dæmon*, or *Genius*, to which their Conduct was committed by the *Supream Being*. To these *Dæmons* they were beholden for their *Happiness*, their εὐδαιμονία, which had its Name from their Title they deriv'd to that happy *Place* of the *Blessed* from their Conjunction with those *Dæmons*, as the κακοδαιμονία was taken for the natural Result of their *degenerated Nature*, destitute of the *Heavenly Principle*, which accordingly confin'd them to *Matter*, and those *ill Dæmons*, who were allow'd the *Dominion* of *Matter*, and all those *less noble Souls* who had no Principle that could intitle them to a *higher Station* than what was *material*. And because this nobler degree of *Human Souls* was deriv'd from the *Sun*, therefore that was taken for the Seat of the δειντατοῦ λόγου, the *Fontal*

M

and

and *Archetypal Λόγος*, from whence all particular λόγοι were deriv'd. The *intellectual Sun* therefore, or (which was, with them, the same) the *Archetypal Λόγος* was, by the *Platonists*, made the Author of all this *Deliverance* (which they also call σωτηρία) from Ὑλη, and from the *Power* of the *Dæmon* of it. So that they who had not this *Divine Principle* from the Λόγος could not pretend to it at all, and therefore must be still presum'd to be under the *Dominion* of Ὑλη and the *Dæmon* which had the *Command* of it. This was the *Doctrine* of the *Mystical Platonists* and *Pythagoreans* in the *Apostles* Age, follow'd by *Numenius*, *Cronius*, *Moderatus Gaditanus*, *Apollophanes*, *Dionysius*, *Longinus*, *Plotinus*, *Porphry*, *Iamblichus*, *Proclus*, *Demetrius*, *Simplicius*, *Hierocles*, and in general by those who pretended to the *Stile* of *Divine*, and to be *Adepts* of the *Mystical Philosophy*.

XXVII.
By the same
Principles,
as owned
by the Sa-
cred Wri-
ters them-
selves, it
appears

This was withal so generally taken for the *Sense* of the *Jews* of the *Apostolical* Age, that the *Heathens*, who receiv'd it, were generally favourable to the *Jews* and their *Sacred Writings*. These are they whom *Porphry* ob-
serv'd

serv'd to have been imitated by our Christian *Origen* in his *mystical Interpretations* of the Writings of the *Old Testament*. And two of them, *Dionysius* and *Porphyry* (of whom we have something extant) quote the *Old Testament* with reverence in Favour of their own Opinions. So also *Chalcedius* deals with *Origen* himself, though *Chalcedius* also was a *Heathen*. *Philo* also is so favourable to this Hypothesis that *Clemens Alexandrinus* calls him a *Pythagorean*. So good an Understanding there was between the *mysticizing Jews* of the *Apostles* Age and the *Platonists* and *Pythagoreans* in these Particulars. Thence we may gather how favourable the *Apostles*, and the *Apostolical Christians*, were likely to have been to these same Opinions before their Conversion to the *Christian Religion*, being bred up generally to the same Notions with the other *Hellenistical Jews*. Who can therefore doubt of their Favour to them still, even after their Conversion, if they found nothing in them contrary to the *new Revelations* of the *Gospel*? But so far they are from any *inconsistency* with our *new Revelations*, that, in truth, the *Reasonings* of the *New*

that unbaptiz'd Persons are suppos'd to be still under the Power of the Devil.

Testament do generally suppose them true. Only they make Application of them to *Christ*, not to *unreveal'd Philosophy*. And the *Phraseology* of our *Christian Scriptures*, and our other *Christian Writers* in that *Age*, is rather taken from the *Hellenistical Version* of the *Old Testament* than from the Text of *Plato*, (where there is any *Difference* between them) or of any other whatsoever *Heathen Philosophers*. Our *New Testament* owns the same Extent of what it calls the *Darkness of this World* with that of what the *Philosophers* call Ὕλη. They use the very same Terms of Ἄδης and Τάρταρος with the *Poets* and *Heathen Philosophers*, and with the same *Meaning* and *Extent*. What the *Philosophers* call Τάρταρος, that the *New Testament* calls the οὐκὶ ἐξώτερον, and by the Name of *Tartarus* also. What the *Philosophers* call Ἄδης in Contradistinction to Τάρταρος, that the *Scripture* the *Darkness of the Air of this World*. And what the *Heathens* call Ἄδης or *Pluto*, or the Δαίμων Ὕλης, that the *Scripture* calls the *Devil*, and *Satan*, and *Belial*. They make the *Devil* an *Evil Being*, and very agreeably to the *Reasonings* of those

those *Times*, as being concern'd with, and confin'd to, *Matter*, which they generally made the *Original* of all *Evil*. This is the most likely Account how the *Jews* and *Christians* came to have so ill an Opinion of all, even the *best*, of the *Heathen Deities*. They conclude them *all* to be *material* in their Constitution, by their *Confinement* to these *sublunary material Regions*, and by the *scandalous Traditions* of their *Poets* (who were the most ancient *Witnesses* of those *Traditions* which related to *Religion*) of the predominating *Concupiscences* of their most celebrated popular *Gods*, those *Concupiscences* being the *Nails* to *Matter*, as *Plato* calls them; and by the *sensible Pleasure* and *Nourishment* they receiv'd from the *Nidor* of their *bloody Sacrifices*, own'd by some of their *Gods* themselves in some of their *Oracles* collected by *Porphry* as *Divine Testimonies* to his own *Enthusiastical Philosophy*, and as expressly *disowned* by the *Supream Being*, the immediate *Tutelar* of the *Jews*, in relation to the *Sacrifices* offer'd to *himself*. The *Scriptures* therefore allow the same *extent* to this *Dominion* of the *Devil* as the *Heathens* did to that

of their *Dæmon* of *Matter*. When the *Devil* is called the *Prince of this World*, that is plainly oppos'd to *Heaven*, which, in the *Stile* of the same inspired Writers, is the *World to come*. And when he is call'd the *Prince of the Darkness of this Air*, the Word *Air* is immediately oppos'd to *Æther*, which was suppos'd to constitute those *Heavenly Bodies* which were thought exempt from all those *Evils* which were suppos'd to have their *Original* from the *Contagion* of this gross mutable fæculent *Matter*, and therefore fit for that *happy Society of Blessed Spirits*. So for the Principle that enables the *Soul* to rise higher than this utmost extent of the *Devil's Jurisdiction*, what the *Philosophers* call Νῆς or Λόγος, that the *Scriptures* call more frequently πνεῦμα, though sometimes also ἑμψύον λόγον, as a *new Nature engrafted or inoculated* into the *Human Soul*, for making up the ὁλοτελής ἀνθρώπου, consisting of *Body, Soul and Spirit*, 1 *Thess.* v. 23. I know not whether *Aristotle* alluded to this when he makes this *Soul*, (which he is thought to have made *Immortal*) θυράδιον ἐπεισέναι, as an external adscititious Principle. It is said to

to be of a *Divine Nature*, 2 St. Pet. i. 4. As the Poet, *Divinae particula auræ*, and as *Plato* calls his Λόγος Δεῖοτατος. *Seneca* calls it a *Holy Spirit*, as the *Scripture*, and makes it a *God within us*, Ep. 42. an *Emanuel*. This is *Plato's* ἀνδρωπῶς ἐσωδης and αὐτοανδρωπῶς; in the *Stile* of the *Scripture*, the *second Adam*, and the *Lord from Heaven*; for this *Notion* also of the *two Men*, the πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν in the ψυχὴ ζῶσα in *Genesis*, was observ'd before the *Apostle*, and to the same purpose, by the *Hellenistical Jews*, as appears in *Philo*. This *Divine Nature* is that which gives us a *Title to Heaven*, which is the proper *Residence* of those Beings that are *Divine*, as well according to the *New Testament* as the *Platonists*. This *Spirit* as it was given to *Adam*, so it had descended from him to his *Posterity*, if he had not forfeited his own and their *Right* to it by his *Original Sin*. But having done so, we have it not as his *Descendents*. The Reasoning of the *Apostle* in 1 Cor. xv. supposes that all we derive from the *first Adam* is the *living Soul*. The *Spirit* he derives from the *second Adam*, the *Lord from Heaven*, which is no other than the Λόγος in this *Stile*

of the *Hellenists*. He is *the Lord from Heaven*, to whom God has subjected this lower World, the Man spoken of, *Psal. viii.* as appears by our Apostle's Doctrine, not only in this Passage, *1 Cor. xv.* but *Ebr. ii.* To him the Father has committed all Authority, as *Plato* makes the *Λόγος* invested with it in the beginning of the *Golden Age*. This *second Adam* is *Christ* who is the same oppos'd by the Apostle to *Adam* in his Epistle to the *Romans*, as the *second Adam* is oppos'd to the *first* in the Epistle to the *Corinthians*. *Christ* therefore and the *second Adam* are the same, as appears also from the *Design* of the Apostle's Reasoning in this Passage to the *Corinthians*, which was to shew that if *Christ* was risen, we must rise also. That would not follow unless the πνεῦμα, and the σῶμα πνευματικόν, so called from the πνεῦμα, had been deriv'd from *Christ*, which he makes there deriv'd from the *second Adam*. He therefore it was in whom the πλήρωμα of the Godhead dwelt, *Col. i. 19. ii. 9.* Of whose fulness we all receive, *Grace for Grace*, *St. John i. 16.* meaning, no doubt, the *Graces* of the Spirit. He had his Name of *Christ* from this *Unction* of the Spirit, which is called
an

an *Unction* in *Us* also, 1 *St. John* ii. 20, 27. He it is *that enlightens every Man that cometh into the World*, *St. John* i. 9. As the *Spirit* is called *Light*, and the giving the *Spirit Illumination* in *Baptism*, even in that *Age* of the *Apostles* as well as afterwards, *Ebr.* vi. 4. x. 32. Alluding to the *Symbol* of *Light* with the $\delta\alpha\delta\epsilon\chi\omicron\iota$ in the *Mysteries*, and the *Fire* carry'd before the *Augusti* and *Augustæ* as a *Symbol* of *Divinity*. This also agreed exactly with the *Notions* of the *Platonists*. The $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron$ was by them also taken for the *Original* of the particular $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota$, and the $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\alpha\acute{\nu}\theta\omega\pi\omicron$ gave the $\epsilon\sigma\kappa\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ to all *particular Men*. Accordingly the *Spirit* as receiv'd from *Christ* is call'd the *Spirit of Christ*. And by *partaking* of his *Spirit* we are said the same way to be made one *Spirit* with him as we are made one *Body* with him by *partaking* of the *Eucharistical Bread*, which he is pleas'd to take for his own *Body*. This *Spirit* therefore is given by our *Saviour* in his *Baptism*, the peculiar *Prerogative* of which is, that it was not, like the *other Baptisms* of that *time*, of *Water* only, but of the *Spirit*. All unbaptiz'd *Persons* therefore were suppos'd to want this *Spirit*
which

which none could give besides our *Saviour*, and therefore could not be expected under any other (however otherwise *perfect*) Dispensation. Not even under the *Law of Moses* it self, *Gal. iii. 2.* Because our *Lord* had not then *instituted* any *ordinary means* for conveying the *Spirit* by *Human Ministry* as he has done under the *Gospel*. This therefore is the *laver of Regeneration* to that *Divine Life* which intitles us to *Heaven*. And here it is that we have ἀναχάωσω πνεύματι & γνῶσις. *Tit. iii. 5.* As ἀναχάωσις alludes to the *new Man* and the *new Creature*, which is alone entitled to the *new Heaven* belonging to the *new Covenant*. And as it implies the *renewal* of that *Divine Spirit* which we *lost* by the *Transgression of Adam*.

XXVIII.
By the same
Principles,
the Condi-
tion of a
Communi-
cant leav-
ing the
true Com-
munion
faultily is
worse than
if he had
never en-
ter'd into
it.

Thus it appears (not from *particular Expressions* only, which are liable to many *Mistakes of Interpretation*, but) from the whole *Hypothesis* which was *cultivated* or *corrected* by the *new Christian Revelations*; that whoever was *out* of the *true Communion*, was, for that Reason, suppos'd *subject* to the *Devil*. It could be no otherwise before *Baptism*, because a Person not yet admitted into the *true Communion* could

could not be suppos'd yet to have receiv'd that *Spirit* which entitled him to a *higher place* than that to which the *Devil's Jurisdiction* was confin'd, and which enabled him as well as entitled him, to avoid that *Jurisdiction*, and withal restrain'd the *Devil's Power* by the Patronage of *God* and his more powerful *Angels*. Nor was there reason, by the same *Principles*, to think better of them who had been of the *true Communion*, if they quitted it, or suffer'd themselves to be judicially driven out of it by their lawful *Superiors*, rather than submit to *unsinful*, however otherwise *hard Conditions* impos'd on them by those same *Superiors* for their *Reconciliation*. Where-ever their *Separation*, either *active* or *passive*, was imputable to themselves, they were by so much judged in a *worse Condition* than *Sinners* of the *true Communion*, at least, as the loss of the *Privileges* of the *true Communion* would make them. *Sins* in the *Communion* are no *Breaches* of the *Covenant* so long as the *Penitent* submits to the *Discipline* requir'd by them whom *God* has *authoriz'd* to represent him in what is thought necessary for the good of the
Pub-

Publick, and for signifying a governable Disposition. And it is a great, though a common popular, Mistake in Writers of Books of Devotion, to look on all Sins of Communicants as Breaches of our Baptismal Vow and our Baptismal Covenant. It is dishonourable and injurious to the Goodness and Long-suffering of God so celebrated in the Scriptures to think so. He knows our Frailty, and our blessed Saviour has a Fellow-feeling of our Infirmities, and therefore is a merciful High-Priest, and makes allowances for them in his Covenant it self, so that his Commandments may not be grievous, so far from being hard or impossible. Nor do we ever find a Breach of Covenant charg'd in Scripture for Sins of daily IncurSION and InfirmitY. So far from that, that he provided Sacrifices in course for Sins of Ignorance in dealing with his old People. So far from that, that it is an expresse Promise to David (one of those Patriarchs by whom the Peculium is intitled to Divine Promises) that God would visit his Childrens Transgression with the Rod, and their Iniquity with Stripes. Nevertheless my loving Kindness (says he) will I not

not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My Covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my Lips. Once have I sworn by my Holiness, that I will not lie unto David, Psal. lxxxix. 32, 33, 34, 35. Himself interprets it as a suffering his Faithfulness to fail, as a breaking of his Covenant, as a lying, to deal with his *Peculium* so as to deprive them of the Benefit of his Covenant for Offences of this Nature, which could not be if they were Breaches of the Covenant on their Part; for (the Covenant being only Conditional) whoever breaks first leaves the other Party at liberty no more to observe his former Obligations without any Violation of Faith. So far God is from taking this Advantage against his People, that it is part of his stipulated Kindness, and an Argument of his owning them for his Children to chastise them to bring them thereby to Repentance; and that, if he made use, even of the Devil, as an Instrument of his Chastisement, for the Destruction of their Flesh, yet it is with that merciful Design, that their Spirit may be sav'd in the Day of the Lord Jesus, 1 Cor. v. 5. Thus far therefore they
are

are not so abandoned to the *Devil*, as to be *deserted* by *God*, as to allow the *Devil* that *Right* over them which he is allow'd over his own *Slaves* and *Captives*, to reckon them among the *Devil's Soldiers*, and his own *Enemies*. But that was indeed taken to be their Case when they were guilty of a *voluntary Defection* from the *Body* and *Government* which alone entitled them to the Protection of *good Spirits*, and to a *Delivery* from *Slavery* to *Evil* ones. It must be so, if *God* interpreted their *Defection* from his *Representatives* as a *Defection* from his own *Government*; if *Christ* also judg'd their leaving his *Church* as a *quitting* their Station of being *Members* of his own *Mystical Body*. And they have given us sufficient *warning* to believe he will do so. But there is withal another Interpretation: *He that is not with me is against me*, St. Matth. xii. 30. as certainly agreeable to our Saviour's *Mind* as the *other*. By which he has declar'd that he will endure no *Neutrality*, no *Lukewarmness*, no *Halting between God and Belial*, but that whosoever does *not* enlist himself in his own *Army* shall be treated as enlisted *against him* under the *General* of his

his *Enemy*, to use the *Military* Language alluded to in our *Baptismal Military Sacrament*. And though our Lord had *not* resolved on this *general Rule* to oblige Men to keep *stedfast* to the *Body* himself has been pleas'd to *own* for *his* ; yet the abetting *opposite Communions* is indeed hardly fairly capable of any other Interpretation than that of a *design'd Hostility*. So, I am sure, all *Acts* of the *like* Nature are generally *interpreted* in relation to all other *supream unappealable visible Governors* in *this World*. Nor could any *Government* in *this World* subsist if they did not *Act* accordingly. So, I am confident, our Adversaries themselves would judge if they had been invested with the *like Superiority*. If therefore this be their Case, that an owning an *opposite Communion* is indeed an *Act of Hostility* against the Lord and *his Christ* ; it must follow that they are henceforward in the *same Condition* wherein they were *before* their *Baptism*, *destitute* of the *good Spirit*, the *Bond* of whose *Unity* they have *broken*, and whose *Conduct* they have thereby virtually *renounc'd* ; under the *Possession* of the *Evil Spirit* who could no more be *kept out* than *thrown out*,

out, but by the more powerful Possessor to whom they had surrend'ed themselves in their *Baptism*. It is the like *Interpretative Renunciation* of the *Spirit* to leave the *Body* that intitled them to the *Spirit* as it was an *Interpretative Submission* to his *Conduct* to enter into that *Body* that first intitled them to it; for in this way of *transacting* by *Covenanting Symbols*, the *Covenant* is suppos'd to be treated as the *Symbols* are. Which being so, I would recommend to their serious Consideration how the *Gospel* describes the Case of the *Evil Spirits* re-entry after a *Dispossession*: *He takes with himself seven other Spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in, and dwell there, and the last State of that Man is worse than the first, St. Matt. xii. 45. St. Luke xi. 24.* By this it appears that the *Possession* of the *Devil* is firmer after the *Ejection* of the good *Spirit*, which was the *Bond* of *Mystical Unity*, than it was before. And indeed the *Scripture* does frequently make the Condition of *Apostates* from the *Christian Communion* worse than that of those who had never been incorporated into it. So *St. Peter*, *If after they have escap'd*
the

the Pollution of the World through the Knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again intangled therein, and overcome; the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of Righteousness than after they have known it, to turn from the Holy Commandment deliver'd to them. But it is happen'd unto them according to the true Proverb; the Dog is turned to his own Vomit again; and the Sow that was washed to her wallowing in the Mire, 2 St. Pet. ii. 20, 21, 22. These Words are plainly to be understood not of that *Uncleanness* which is contracted by *Immoral Practices* (which are not always worse in *Apostates* than in *unbaptiz'd Persons*) but of that which was deriv'd from the *Inhabitation* of these *unclean Spirits*. So it agrees with the Proportion of *Seven unclean Spirits* concerned in the *second Possession*, each of them worse than him who had alone possess'd him before. In this regard they are compared with the *impurest Animals*, *Dogs* and *Sows*. The *Devil* is still represented in the *Military Dialect*, as securing his recovered Possession with a

N stronger

stronger Guard than that which had lost it. *The more unclean the Spirits,* the more unclean the Person is that is possess'd by them. And the greater number there is of them, the more difficultly they are dispossess'd. So it was in the Case of the *Legion*. The Person possess'd by them was so much the more outrageous and violent. If therefore his *Impurity* before his Reception made him unfit for any *Holy Offices* or *Acts* of Communion with the good Spirit, he must be much more so proportionably after his *Apostacy*. This perfectly agrees with the severe Texts of the Sacred Author to the *Ebrians*; *It is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the Heavenly Gift, and were made Partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good Word of God, and the Powers of the World to come; if they shall fall away, to renew them again to Repentance: Seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open Shame,* Ebr. vi. 4, 5, 6. And again; *If we sin wilfully after that we have receiv'd the Knowledge of the Truth, there remaineth no more Sacrifice for Sins, but a certain fearful looking for of Judgment*

ment and fiery Indignation, which shall devour the Adversaries, x. 26, 27. This is expressly apply'd to the Case of deserting the Church Assemblies, v. 25. as I have elsewhere observ'd. And all these and the like Expressions were design'd to deter Apostates from the Christian Communion, which was the great Concern of that Age. Purposely to let them understand that, though Repentance would be accepted in the true Communion whenever it was sincere; yet God would not endure Desultoriness in owning that Communion which could alone intitle them to Acceptance when they were truly penitent. This also I take to be the Case of the Apostolical Hermas in owning one only Repentance. But I urge it only to shew that it is no Alleviation of their Crime, that they still own the Name of Christ at the same time that they rebel against all that he has authoriz'd to represent him on Earth, in relation to the Exercise of his spiritual Authority in this World; for the Scripture is every where clear in aggravating the Ingratitude of those who have receiv'd the greatest Divine Favours, and in professing the greatest Resentment and Severity to such Persons.

Tyre and Sidon might hope for more Indulgence in the Day of Judgment than Chorazin and Bethsaida. And Capernaum which had been exalted to Heaven in Favours, was to be thrust down to Hell in the exemplary Severity of her Punishment.

XXIX.
The casting
off all the
visible Au-
thority of a
Jurisdicti-
on (especi-
ally when it
is not pre-
tended to
be in fa-
vour of a
Rival Pow-
er, which
may pre-
tend a bet-
ter Right,
by the Laws
of the Suc-
cession) is
not recon-
cilable with
our owning
our Sub-
jection to
God, and
Christ him-
self. And
therefore
is, by fair
Interpre-
tation, ac-
cording to
Scripture
Reason-

It is abundantly sufficient for my present purpose, that Separatists from the Communion of the visible Church can pretend no Privilege, by Scripture Principles, for their Exemption from the Power of the Devil above those who had never been admitted into the Church's Communion. Rather, on the contrary, their Condition, by the same Reasoning, has appear'd to be the worse of the two. This being granted, it will plainly appear that, by the same Scriptures, no, even Occasional, Communion can be justify'd with more than that one Communion which we believe, in our Consciences, to have deriv'd the Authority of the Apostles, in Opposition to all other Communions which have set up themselves in Opposition to it. For none can pretend it lawful to communicate with the Devil, even occasionally. None can pretend it lawful to communicate with the Seven Devils of an Apostate, if it was

un-

unlawful to communicate with the *single Devil*, which was suppos'd to be in him before his *Baptism*. But this Reasoning proceeds much more strongly against *Local Schismatics* against the *unquestionable Authority* of the *jurisdiction* when the *Schism* was first made, which was the Case of our *Non-conformists*. Their *Separation* was not in *Favour* of any Government that could pretend a better Title than that which they found actually in Possession. It was not in Favour of one *Bishop* who might pretend a better Title, by the Laws of *Succession*, than could be pleaded for him whom they deserted. Had it been so, there might have been a *Subjection* to *Christ's visible Substitutes* pleadable on both sides, if the Question had only been, what Person had the better Title to be that *visible Substitute*. The Proof in such a Case might depend on *Facts* of so secret Cognizance as might easily be mistaken by very well-meaning Persons to the *visible Government* of the Church in this Life. The mistaken Person therefore as to the Right might still maintain the Principles requisite for deriving Government in the same *visible Body* for future Ages. And his Error might be more pardonable when it proceeded no

ings, a revolting to him, who (by the same Scripture Principles) is suppos'd to Head all Oppositions to God and his Christ.

farther than the *single Fact*, and could be no ill *Precedent* for the *future*. Our Adversaries Case is such, as, if it may be allow'd to pass into a *Precedent*, will overthrow the whole *Right* of *Christ* of governing his *visible Church* by *visible Substitutes*. So that, unless he be pleas'd to interpose *immediately* by *New Revelations* attested by *new Miracles*, they will not suffer him to provide for the good Government of his Church by any *general Establishments* to be deriv'd to *Posterity* (as others of the like kind are usually) by Rulers of *lawful Succession*. They, on the contrary, take upon them to innovate in what they found settled in such a way, as (if imitated) will allow *no Security* for any Rules of *Christ* once laid down by him against *powerful*, though *unrightful*, Innovators. They have not *dispossess'd* the *Bishops* then in Being when they began their Disturbances, in favour of *other Bishops* for whom a *better Title* could be pretended by any acknowledged *Rules* then receiv'd by the *Constitution*; but have overthrown the whole *Order* of *Episcopacy*, and therefore, to be sure, the *lawful*, as well as the *unlawful* Successors. They have not done this by any regular *Appeal* to any *Superior*

Ju-

Judicatory allow'd by the *Church* to judge the Cause between *Episcopacy* and their own new *invented* Forms of *Government*. They knew the *Order* of *Episcopacy* was universally receiv'd as *Supream*, and *unaccountable* to any *superior Judicatory* on *Earth*, in relation to its *Spirituals*. Nor had they any *Consent* of the *Order* to *de-vest* themselves of that undoubted *Power* of which they were *actually* possess'd. Nor was there one *Presbytery* in being that could pretend to have been *possess'd*, or therefore capable of being *wrong'd*, of the *Power* by them asserted to *Presbyteries*. Not one *Presbytery* in the *World*, that had *preserv'd* its pretended *Liberties* within Memory of any *History* since the *Death* of the *Apostles*. Not one *single Presbyter* living in the *World* that could ever pretend to have *had* those *Rights* of which they pretend that *all* were robbed. They can therefore pretend nothing for their *new Establishments* but *Violence*, and *Violence* from Persons no way *authoriz'd* by *Christ* to *represent*, or *conclude*, him. *Violence* from the *Presbyters* who had *receiv'd* all the *Power* they truly had from the *Bishops*, and had never

received any *Power* but what was *dependent* and *subordinate* to them who gave it by the *Laws* of the *Constitution* then in being, and was intended for such by them who gave it, which therefore never could legitimate any *Insurrections* against the *Episcopal Order*. *Violence* from the *Magistrates*, who cannot, in the least, pretend to *Spiritual Power*, without whom, and against whom, it was maintain'd in the purest and most flourishing Times of our *Christian Religion*. Thus it appears to have been a manifest *Defection* from all the *visible Authority* of the *Church* for the Time being. This is a *rebellling* against the *Lord* and his *Anointed*, in the Language of the *Psalmist*; against the *Father* and the *Son*, in that of *St. John*; it is a *breaking their Bonds asunder*, and *casting away their Cords from them*, as far as it is in the *Power* of *Mortals* to be guilty of it. So it is by those *Rules* of *Government* which have been receiv'd by the *Consent* of *Nations* as inseparable from the *Interests* of *Government* in general. Who ever doubts but that an open *Resistance* of all the *subordinate local Government* establish'd by a *Prince* is a *Rebellion* against the
Su-

Supream Power by which it was establish'd? Who doubts but that it is the same Case, though the *Rebellion* be in a *future Generation*, under a *Successor*, and in any *Age* of the *Succession*, as if it were in the *time* of the *Establishment*, and of the passing of the *Charter* by which the *Rules of Succession* are prescrib'd for *legitimizing Titles* in *future Ages*? So the *Criminals* always find it upon their *Trials*. So *God* himself professes he will understand it, that he will so *interpret* *Affronts* offer'd to his *authoriz'd Representatives* as if they were offer'd to *himself*. So *Moses* as inspir'd by him; *What are we? Your Murmurings are not against us, but against the Lord*, *Exod. xvi. 8*. So in the Case of *Samuel*; *They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them*, *1 Sam. viii. 7*. So in that of the *Apostles*; *He that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me*, *St. Luke x. 16*. As *St. John* made the *νομιμα* with the *Father* and the *Son* to depend on the *νομιμα* with the *Apostles*: So, by this *Reasoning*, it appears, that *Alienation* from the *External Communion* with the *Apostles* di-

divided also from *Communion* with the *Father* and the *Son*. So in the Case of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*: *Thou hast not lied unto Men, but unto God*, Acts v. 4. And; *How is it that ye have agreed together, to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?* v. 9. By this *Interpretation* it appears, that refusing to be govern'd by God's *visible Substitutes* is a refusal to be govern'd by God himself, and forcing them is an Endeavour (if it had been in their Power) to force him, and can be no otherwise interpreted, by the common *Laws* of Government in general, than as an Act of *Hostility*, especially when persisted in, and justify'd by *Principles*. So it is also to alter his *Constitutions* by force, against the *Will* of those whom he has *Authoriz'd* for that purpose, to take care that the *visible Government* of his Church be manag'd, and convey'd down to *Posterity*, according to his *first Establishment*. This utterly ruins all his *Security* for having his *Will* observ'd for the future, and legitimates for the future also all violent Exercises of *unrightful Power* for destroying his *Establishments*. It perfectly dissolves the Government, and (in doing so) dissolves the *Body* also.

also. It puts the *Legislative Power* of it in the Hand of *Rebels* who govern by their *own Will*, not *God's*; yet have the Boldness to pretend his *own Authority* when they act in *defiance* to it. What can be *Hostility* if this be not so? And whom can they pretend to serve by such *open Hostilities*, but the *Head* of all his *Enemies*, the *Devil*? So they have reason to believe that God *may*, and *will*, interpret it. This is a far more evident Case when the whole Dispute is between *Spiritual Authority* and such as are *Subjects indisputably* by the *Constitution* in being, than if it were between two *pretended Authorities*, as it is in the *Schisms* of *whole Churches*. Each of such Parties may act *bonâ fide*, and *design* really to *retain* their *Duty* to *Christ* if the *Evidence* be indeed *litigious* for proving who has the *Plea* to *Christ's Authority*. This Case is far less excusable from the Charge of *open Hostility*, where there can be *no Plea* of *Authority* by the *present Constitution*.

We need not therefore insist on the Charge of *Hypocrisy*, which may needlessly *provoke*, and is impossible to be *prov'd*, as it purely regards *Mens Hearts*, if it be not *discover'd* by

xxx.

The Case of Occasional Communion is real Prevarication, though

ouvert the Com-

municants
be not con-
scious of
their being
guilty of it.

ouvert Acts. It is sufficient for our purpose, that I have shewn that *Communion*, in the *Nature* of the *thing*, was design'd to *unite* the *Communicant* with the *Church* in which the *Communion* is receiv'd; and that *Communion* does not consist in a common belief in *Doctrinals*, but a *Participation* in *Sacraments*, and other *Holy Offices*. The *Devils* believe as the *Church* does, and tremble too. Yet that does not therefore prove them in the *Church's Communion*. So also did the *Catechumens*; but were not therefore accounted *Members* of *Christ*, nor of his *Church*, nor could they claim any *Rights* of such *Membership* 'till they were *incorporated* by *Baptism*. *Faith* therefore does *dispose* Men to be *Members*, but does not actually *make* them so, so as to *supersede* the use of the *Sacraments*. He that *believes* therefore is not qualify'd for *Salvation* except he be *baptiz'd* also. *St. Mark* xvi. 16. though *unbelief* alone suffices for *Damnation*, as it makes a Man *unable* of *Baptism*. The *Sacraments* therefore are they which *incorporate* us, and our *receiving* them implies that we *own* and *profess* that *Union* and *Incorporation*. Accordingly all
Bre-

Brethren of the same Communion have reason so to understand us, that we profess our selves *one* with *them* when they see us *communicate* with *them*; and have reason to *censure* us as *Prevaricators* if they see us do any thing *unsuitable* to that Profession. And so it is to *communicate* in any *Sacraments*, or indeed in any *Holy Offices*, with *those* who are *divided* from that Body into which *we* are *incorporated*. That is a *Profession* that we are *one* with them who are *divided* also, and consequently that we our selves are *divided* from that same *Body*, to which, notwithstanding at the same time, we *profess* our selves *united*. And what can any one pretend to purge *two* so *contrary* Professions from plain *Prevarication*? Nothing, certainly, if we had lived in *those Times* when *Communion* was thus *universally* interpreted, as well by *Adversaries*, as *Friends*, of the *true Communion*. Nothing, if that *Interpretation* had, even *now*, been as *universally receiv'd* as it was *then*. Which it would certainly have been, if the *Nature* of our *Christian Communion*, as settled by the *last Acts* of the *Apostles*, had *now* been as truly understood as it was *then*. The only thing

thing that makes this Case *different* from what it would have been *then*, is, that Christians are not *now* so generally *agreed*, as *then*, in the true *Nature* of *Christian Communion*; and in the *Inconsistency* of owning two *opposite Communions* at the *same time*. This makes it possible that a Person *really* guilty of this *Inconsistency*, may, notwithstanding, not be *sensible* of the *Inconsistency*, and therefore not guilty of *Prevarication* in the Judgment of his own *Conscience*. This may be sufficient to *purge* him in an *Age*, wherein so *few* are sensible of their *Duty* in this particular Case, before the *Inconsistency* of *opposite Communions* be understood, and the *Arguments*, proving them inconsistent, be sufficiently *propos'd*. But when they are, the Arguments which were formerly *sufficient* to make all particular Members *unanimous* in *judging* opposite Communions *inconsistent* with *Sincerity*, may very well be *presum'd sufficient* to produce the same effect *again*, when they are *consider'd* with the like *Application*, and the like *Impartiality*. All therefore that can be said in Defence of such Persons after they have *heard* and *consider'd* our *Reasons*, is what might

might have been said in Defence of *Marcus Antoninus* and *Epictetus* for their not believing the *Credentials* of our *Christian Religion*. We *Christians* cannot impute it to the *Insufficiency* of the *Arguments*, which we believe so *evident* as to be *sufficient* to *convince* all *impartial* Considerers of them, as well as they have done our *selves*. We can therefore impute the *want* of *Success* to nothing but the *want* of *Diligence*, (even in those otherwise very excellent Persons) in *examining* our *Reasons*, or *Prejudices* of their *Education*. Nor have we reason to charge our selves with any *Uncharitableness* in *judging* so concerning them, though we cannot pretend to *know* their *Diligence* and *Sincerity* so well as *themselves*. Yet the *Evidences* of *Christianity*, by which *we* judge, are certainly *better* known to *us* than any *other* Man's *Diligence* and *Sincerity*. Not only so, but *better* also than our *own* *Hearts* in *Cases* where we have *Interests* or *Prejudices* to tempt us to *Partiality*. And that is enough to prove our *Reasonings* of this kind *safe* and *prudent*. Besides our *harder* *Thoughts* concerning *Cases* of this nature add nothing to the *Nature* of the

the Cases *themselves*; but only lay an *Obligation* on Persons *concern'd* in the Cases, so far as they are willing to stand *fair* in the *Opinions* of *others* (whom they have reason to regard *more than themselves*, in Cases where there is any Suspicion of *private Interest*) to *quicken* their *Diligence*, and to put them on the severest *Trials* of their own *Sincerity*. And this is certainly no more than what was *intended*, and will be *approved*, by God himself, in order to the *bringing* them to *true Opinions* of so great Importance to their own *most important* Interests. They have therefore no reason to take such *hard* Thoughts of their present Condition *ill*, when they are so *necessary* for their *own* greatest *Concernments*; and when it is so *easy* for them to make their Condition more *secure*, by *complying* with the *Divine Institutions*, from which they have no reason to believe that God ever *intended* to excuse them in the *design'd* Neglect of any *possible* means; and when withal these *harsher* Censures are grounded on the most evident and solid *Reasonings* that come under *our* Cognizance. Surer, I am sure, than those by which we can judge of any
others,

others, or even of our own, *Sincerity*. However I take no more upon me to judge the *Hearts* of our present Adversaries than I would if I were concern'd in a Dispute with the fore-mention'd admirable moral *Heathens*. I only prove that the *Nature* of *Communion*, according to the true *Design* of the *Apostles*, and of the *Holy Spirit* by which they were directed in settling it, implies the owning an *Obligation* to abstain from all *opposite Communions* by him who communicates with any particular *Communion* on true *Principles*. This proves the Case of the *occasional Communicant* to be real *Prevarication*, though, I confess, it does not prove that, he that is really guilty of the *Prevarication*, does actually believe it so. He *prevaricates* with the *Church* in communicating with the *Dividers* from it, whom he was presum'd to renounce in communicating with those from whom the *Dividers* had separated themselves by their *divided Assemblies*. He again *prevaricates* with the *Dividers* in owning himself *divided* from the *Church* (as they are) by his communicating with them in their *opposite Assemblies*, whilst, at the same time, he professes himself one

O

with

with the *true Church* by communicating with *her*. That is not all. The same *Reasonings* will oblige the occasional Communicant *himself* to believe the *Case* guilty of *Prevarication* when he shall be pleas'd to examine them impartially, as the *Credentials* of the *Christian Religion* would have convinc'd those *Pious Heathens* on the like Terms of an *unprejudic'd Enquiry*. That it would have had that Effect upon them we have reason to presume, not from our own *private Opinions now*, but from the notorious *Unanimity* of those *Ages* wherein it was best known, and most equally consider'd. And whilst we believe so, we can impute the want of Success for the future to nothing but some *Defect* on *their* part, though we can no more prove it against *them*, (if they will deny it) than we could have done in the *Case* of *Marcus Antoninus* and *Epiſtetus*. All we can do is to refer them to *him*, who is at last to judge them, and to their own *Consciences*, which will then be *unexceptionable Evidences* in their *Case* as they shall deserve. Let them approve themselves in *that* *Judicatory*, and they need not be solicitous what *we* think of them who have

have no *Authority* to judge them, and who are likely to have enough to answer for our *selves*. Yet they ought not too easily to *sight* the Judgment of those whom God has invested with his *own Authority*, if they will indeed purge themselves from the Charge of *Undutifulness* to him with whose *Authority* they are invested. As God is concern'd to maintain the *Authority* himself has given, so they have reason to fear that he will reckon the Judgment given by *that Authority* as his *own* also, and as *futuri judicii Præjudicium*, to use the Words of *Textullian*. This will oblige him not easily to vary from it, and make it not safe for our Adversaries to be liable to the *Consequences* of it. It must utterly destroy the *Ends* of *Authority* in *this Life* to admit of *ease Appeals* from it to a *Judicatory* which is not to be heard in *this Life*. Such *Decisions* come too late for most *Ecclesiastical Trials* which only concern Persons living, and the use of *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction* as it is capable of being exercis'd in *this Life*. This it will utterly destroy if *Rebellions* and *opposite Societies* must be left without remedy, and all *decisive Sentences* given by vi-

sible Ecclesiastical Authority must be suspended 'till the Day of *Judgment*. Yet such *Suspensions* and *Arrests* of *Judgment* must be allow'd 'till the *Supream Judicatory* has declared, wherever the *Appeals* themselves are allowable. The *Subject* loses the *Protection* of his *Appeal* if the *subordinate Court* proceed while the *Appeal* is depending. And a *visible Court* loses its *Jurisdiction* if it must for ever lose the use of its *visible Jurisdiction*, on Pretence of *Appeals* to a *Judicatory* that is not likely to give any *definitive Sentence* in *this Life*. Nor is it credible that *God* will allow this in the Case of a *visible Jurisdiction* constituted by himself.

XXXI.
Occasional
Communi-
on is not
really the
way to
Peace and
Union, but
downright
Hostility.

The Name of *Peace* and *Unity* ought to be very dear to all good Men, and would go far to recommend our *Occasional Conformists*, if it could be as truly, as plausibly, pretended in Favour of them. But such *Occasional Communion* is not sufficient to answer the principal *End* of *Communion*, as to its original *design*, of making the *Adversaries* one, and at *Peace*, with the *true Church*. They still continue their *Hostilities*, whilst they *statedly* communicate with the *Church's Enemies*,

mies, though it had been only *occasionally* also. So, I am sure, the *Law of War*, and the *Law of Nations* too, interpret it, if any *Soldiers* of an *Army* be found to *correspond* with the *Enemies*. Such are *themselves* judg'd *Enemies*, and *treated* accordingly, whenever such suspicious *Correspondence* can be *proved* upon them. Why should it not therefore be the *same* way treated in the *Discipline* of the *Church*, as express'd in the *military* Phrases of *συμβραχίς* and *ἀπὸ βραχίς* between *Christ* and *Satan*? Much more it is presum'd so, if their *more frequent* Residence be in the *Enemy's* Quarters, which is the Case of those who communicate *statedly* in *Schism*, and only *occasionally* with the *Church*. What *General* ever treats *such* as *Peaceable Members* of his *own Army*? Much less will he do so, if the *Occasional Communicant* own this to be *his* Case, and *justify* it by *Principles*, and plead his *Obligation*, in *Conscience*, to *continue* such *Practices* so contrary to *Military Discipline*. This is plainly to *own* the *Enemy's*, for the better, Cause. It is to *own* his *own Obligation* to *defend* it, and that in *Conscience* also. Where is there a

Government so weak that takes not such for *Enemies* who so openly profess their favour to *Enemies*? That still is so imposed on by Persons dealing so openly, as, notwithstanding this free dealing, to mistake them for *Peaceable* and *united* in their common Interests? Indeed, how can they more openly own themselves of the *Enemy's Party* than by such avowed *Obligations* to serve and prefer them, whenever it is in their power to do so? And can they (at the same time) pretend to *Peace* and *Unity* with the *Church* whilst they own themselves oblig'd, in *Conscience*, to ruin the *Episcopal Government* of it? In vain do they pretend to *Peace* and *Unity* with any *Body Politick* who own such *Hostilities* to the *Government* of it. In vain do they pretend to *Union* by *Principles* who justify, by *Principles*, *Rebellion*, not only to the *Governors*, but the *Government* it self. Yet that is the Case of our *Occasional Communicants*. It is the *Military Oath* that makes the *Army*, at least their owning an *Obligation* to be governed, not only by the *General*, but the *Subordinate* *Commanders* also in their respective *Stations*. Without this, what-
ever

ever their *Numbers* may be, we cannot call them an *Army*. If in an *Army* of *Ten Thousand* Men there be no more than 500 that own their *Duty* to their *Officers*, that *Army* is but 500 strong. And therefore no more are really of the *Army*, or can pretend to any *Union* of the *Political Body* which bears that Name. And so it appears in our present Case, whenever it comes to a Trial by Principles of Conscience. Whenever the *Magistrate* deserts the Cause of *Episcopacy*, there is nothing then that can oblige them to continue one *Body* with us. Nothing to oblige them, in Conscience, to observe the Injunctions of the *Bishops*, when displeasing to *Flesh and Blood*, while they neither like *Episcopacy*, nor allow of any Interposition of a lawful *Authority* in things indifferent. The *Union* therefore they pretend to is not such as was practiced in the best and purest Times, when none disputed the *Authority* of the *Bishops* though no *Magistrate* own'd it. It is not such as was settled by the *Apostles* when all the *Magistrates* in the *World* oppos'd it. So far they were from contributing any thing on their part that might oblige their Subjects

jects to acknowledge it. Nor is it such as will suffice for making them one *Spiritual Body* with those who think *Succession* essentially necessary for deriving an *Authority* in the *Spiritual Body* from the *Apostles* to our *Times*; and who do withal believe that no such *Succession* can now be pretended any where under any form of *Ecclesiastical Government* besides that which is *Episcopal*. Their *communicating* in the *Episcopal Communion* would indeed have made them one with the *Episcopals* if they had been true to the *Terms of Communion*, which would, as I have shewn, have obliged them to forbear all other *opposite Communions*. But according to their present *Practice*, of making it only *Occasional*, it cannot unite them. Their *stated Communion* breaks them off from all the *Benefits* of the *Cælestial Communion*, and makes them one with those who are *divided*, which is *inconsistent* with their *Union* with that same *Body* from which they are supposed thus to *profess* themselves *divided*. Nor will God own them as *united* who profess no other *Union* but what is *occasional*. The utmost that can be fairly inferred from such a *Communion* is only

only a *Cessation of Hostilities*, which is very reconcilable with a *hostile State*, such as is between *Enemies profess'd*, during the time of a *Truce*. A *Peace* they cannot properly call it, much less a *Union*, whilst they retain their *hostile Principles*; whilst they are not *intirely* free from *hostile Practices*, in communicating with *profess'd Adversaries*. They cannot be *one* with the *Episcopals* who own no *Obligation in Conscience to Episcopacy*, which is the *uniting Principle* of the Church as a *Society* and a *Communion*. Indeed the *Bishop* is the *Principle of Unity*, according to the *Doctrine of the Primitive Church*. They cannot be so who, while they communicate with *Episcopacy* in *one Jurisdiction*, profess themselves *ready to communicate* with the *Orders and Sacraments of Rebel-Presbyteries* in *another*, where *true Episcopals* cannot *communicate* with *them*. They cannot be so, who *desert* all *Episcopacy* when *Episcopacy* it self is *deserted* by the *Civil Magistrate*, where nothing but *Conscience* can *oblige* them to be *subject to Episcopacy*. In this *Case* *they* and the *Episcopals* must necessarily make *two Communions*. They can-

cannot be so who think themselves obliged to *destroy* Episcopacy, without *which* we cannot communicate with them, as we also think our selves obliged in *Conscience* to *disown* and to *oppose* their wrongfully possess'd *Presbyteries*. Where then is the so much boasted *Unity* and *Peaceableness* of our *Occasional Communicants*?

XXXII.
Occasional
Communi-
cants, by
their still
retaining
their Hostile
Principles,
are the
more dan-
gerous to
the Church
for their be-
ing nume-
rous whilst
they are
owned as
Members
of the
Church.

But the most plausible Plea is that of the *Multitude* of *Profelytes* that might be *gained* to the *Church* by the allowance of *Occasional Communion*. Could we be secure they would be *Converts* and *Profelytes*, no doubt the Suggestion which would make them so must needs be very acceptable to all hearty *Lovers* of our dear Mother, the *Church of England*. And the more acceptable by how much the Prospect were more promising of greater *Numbers*. But who can undertake that they who may be induced to *come* into our *Churches* on these Conditions, will indeed be *Profelytes*? Who can undertake that, at least, the *greatest Number* of them, will ever be so? What the *Event* may be, depends on the very contingent Dispositions of so many *free Wills*, which it is impossible for
any

any *Human Prudence* to *foresee*. And I am sure we have no great reason to *forebode* well from our past *Experience*, which has not afforded us so many *thorough Converts* among the *multitudes* of our *Occasional Communicants*. And if they should still *retain* their former *hostile Principles* and *Practices*, they will be the *more hurtful* for *seeming* only to be *Profelytes*, and for being *really numerous*. The *fewer Enemies*, the better. And still the better for the *Publick* if they be *out* of the *Body*, than if they be *owned* as *Members* of it. The *Army* foremention'd that had only 500 *obedient* to *Discipline*, but far greater Numbers of those who *disputed* their *Duty* to their *Superiors*, would not be able to do what 500 *alone* might do. One *Enemy* in the *Body* is a *double Advantage* to those who are in *open Hostility*. It *adds* one to their *appearing Numbers*, and *takes away* one from the *Numbers* of those that should *oppose* them. That is not all. They have also many *Opportunities* for *ruining* a *Body* by being *owned* as *Members*, that have enabled *single Persons* *within* to effect what *numerous Bodies* *without* could never have *perform'd*.

form'd. They know the *Secrets* and *Weaknesses* of their *own* Body without the Hazards of *Misinformation* and *Infidelity* of that Intelligence which is to be procured by *Spies*. They are *present* to lay hold on *Opportunities* for what themselves can do *alone*; and can *correspond* with the *Enemy* with less *Suspicion* than they who *openly* own'd him, to have his *Assistance* in any thing that proves too difficult for their *own* Power. They qualify themselves for *Trusts*, and thereby make the *Powers* of their *own* Body to *help* the *Enemy*, and to contribute to its *own* Ruin. I am sure we found it so to our Cost in the *Old Rebellion*, if it be true what we are told by credible and coæval Witnesses, that far the *greatest* Part of that *long Parliament* and *Assembly* of *Divines* were *Communicants* with the *Church of England*, who yet *ruined* the *Church* with which *themselves* communicated by a very great *Majority*. And what Security have we that the like *Occasional Communicants*, acting on the same *Principles*, will not do the same again? They cannot be *true* to the *Principles* openly owned by them if they do not do so. And why

why should we trust their fair Pretences of good *Nature* against their *Principles*? Why should we put it in their power to ruin us if their *Principles* should prevail, as they certainly must if they be indeed the *sincere Dealers* they pretend to be, and as they, who plead for them, would persuade us to believe? If that be so, our Cause is desperate; for we can never hope that such Men will ever prefer their *Favour* to *Men* before what themselves believe to be the Cause of God. We find too many ill effects of such Persons being numerous, to wish them more. Wherever they are so, the *Bishop's Power* is more disputed, the *Clergy* less revered, whatever is sacred is more easily invaded, our *Holy Persons*, our *Holy Places*, our *Holy Offices*, our *Holy Revenues*. They are not asham'd to upbraid the best *Friends* of the *Church* with being *Popishly affected* for no other reason but their observing the *Discipline* of the *Church*, themselves communicate with, better than themselves. And by admitting them to *Trusts* and *Authority*, we put it in their Power to ruin our *Doctrine* and *Discipline*, when ever they prove too numerous

merous for Persons that are *better affected*. Bishops of their mind may make what Changes they please, whenever they can *overvote* their *Episcopal Brethren*. And that in the *Name*, and by the *Authority*, of the *Church of England* it self. They may suffer our *Episcopal Succession* to fail with their *Persons*, if they may only be permitted to enjoy the *Episcopal Revenues* for their *own Lives*. Who can pretend a *Zeal* for our *Church*, and the *good* of *Souls* concerned in its *Prosperity*; and not think such *Hazards*, as these are, *seasonable* Occasions for the utmost heights of an inflamed *reasonable Zeal*?

XXXIII.
An Address
to the Bishops.

And who can be more proper to receive *Addressees*, on this Occasion, than the *Fathers* of our unhappily *divided Church*? And I desire to do it with all the *Deference* that is due to their *Holy Function*. *Zeal* is the Duty of every *good Man*, where the *Matter* is of sufficient *Importance*. I know not how it is reconcilable with the Office of such a Person, to believe things of the utmost *consequence* in *hazard*, and not to be *vehemently* concern'd for them, or not to use his *utmost Diligence* and

En-

Endeavours for preserving them. What have we all our *Talents* for but to lay them out on those Services which are most *valued* by the munificent *Donor* of them? And how can we better satisfy our *own Consciences*, and fit ourselves for giving up our *Accounts* of them with *Comfort* and *Confidence*, than by using them accordingly? And what does the *Lover* of *Souls* value more than the Promotion of their *Eternal Interests*? And what can more effectually secure them than the *Validity* of God's *Ordinances*, without which they can give no *Security*? Zeal therefore is recommended by the Apostle to *all*, even the *Laity*. But your *Office* lays peculiar Obligations on *you* to take care that you add this to your other Accomplishments that may fit you to discharge it. The great *Bishop* of our *Souls*, whom, no doubt, you will believe it your *Duty* to imitate, as it is your *Honour* to represent him, was particularly remarkable for this, that the Zeal of God's House did eat him up. St. *Joh.* ii. 17. This was also the Case of *David*, as he was a *Type* of him. *Psal.* lxi. 10. And *Phineas* the *High-Priest* obtain'd a Promise that

that his *Priesthood* should be *everlasting* (that is, that it should be *continued* in his *Family* when it was to be taken away from the *Family* of *Ithamar*) because he was *zealous* for his *God*. Numb. xxv. 11, 13. Eccl. xlv. 23. *God* himself is represented as *clad with Zeal as with a Cloak*. Isa. lix. 17. And he is the *first Archetypal Principle* of *Unity* represented by you. You are particularly *intrusted* with the *Power* and *Discipline* of the *Church*, and must take care *ne quid Respublica detrimenti capiat*, and will be answerable according to the *degree* of *Detriment* that may *follow* by your *Neglect*. You are to *deliver* your *Authority* to your *Successors* as full as you receiv'd it from your *Predecessors*. How can you do so if you suffer *open Enemies* openly *professing Hostility* to be *owned* as *Members* of your *Bodies*, for no other Reason but because themselves make no scruple of *professing* themselves so? How can you secure the *Publick* against them if you do not take the *Securities* required by your *Predecessors*, who had any *Zeal* for *Discipline*, of *renouncing* their *Schismatical Facts* and their *Schismatical Principles*? This gives

gives them a *liberty*, when they please, to *return* to their former *Vomit*, and *Authorizes* others to follow their *Example* when they see *Rebellious Principles* allowed in *Church-Members*. This utterly *dissolves* all *Obligation* in *Conscience* to the *Spiritual Government* if it must be *allow'd* in the *Body* for *uncensurable Doctrine*, that Men may *justify* their *Rebellions* against it by *Principles of Conscience*. It naturally involves you in all the *Guilt* of the *Heresies*, and *Schisms*, and *unpunishable Scandals* and *Immoralities*, and of all the *Souls* that may *perish* by any of these *Occasions*, when the *Authority* is thus *ruin'd* by such *Members* as shall be admitted on such *Terms* as these. And the *Guilt* must be proportionably *greater* as the *Points* are of the *greater Consequence*. It will make these *Mischiefs*, even in *future Ages*, more severely chargeable on *you* than on the respective *Governors* for the *time being*, as it was much more *easy* for *you* to have *preserv'd* the *Rights* of *Government* transmitted to you from your *Ancestors*, than it will be for *them* to *retrieve* them. The *Servant* in the *Gospel* who *restor'd* his Master's

P

Talent

Talent without *increase* was, you know, severely *censur'd* for doing so. What can you say who fall *short* of even so blamable an *Example*? who lose the *Authority* which your *Predecessors* preserv'd better than you do? If the *unprofitable* *Servant* who did not improve his Master's *Talent* was judg'd worthy of so great a *Punishment*, what can you say who are *embezzling* them? who can give no good *Account* of even those which you have receiv'd? What can deserve your *Zeal*, if these things be neglected by you? Remember, I beseech you, the *Trial* of your glorious *Predecessors* of the Tribe of *Levi*. When *Moses* put the *Question*, *Who is on the Lord's side?* Let him come unto me; they all are said to have gather'd themselves together unto him, *Exod. xxxii. 26*. The *Trial* then was to *destroy* their nearest *Relations*, that were concern'd in the *Idolatry* of the *Golden Calf*. And see how the *Holy Spirit* commends their *Zeal* in this particular; *Who said unto his Father and to his Mother, I have not seen him, neither did he acknowledge his Brethren, nor knew his own Children*. Then it follows:

lows: *They shall teach Jacob thy Judgments, and Israel thy Law: They shall put Incense before thee, and whole burnt Sacrifice upon thine Altar,* Deut. xxxiii. 9, 10. Their Service at the *Altar* seems here to be *owned* to have been the *Reward* of their *Zeal* and *Self-denial* in that Case. God requires no such *hard* things for you to approve your *Zeal* in. Not the *Blood* of any that are *dear* to you; but a *Self-denial*, which may be as *beneficial* to *them* as to your *selves*. No *harm* to their *Bodies*, but the greatest *Advantage* that can be for their greatest *Interests*, if *themselves* please. Do not displease God to gratify *them*. Do not, in *Favour* to them, encourage them to *live* and *die* in a perpetual *Contempt* of the *Divine Institutions*. It is, in truth, no *Favour* to *them*, but the greatest *Unkindness* and *Cruelty* to them to encourage them to think *well* of themselves in *that* Condition, and to continue *impenitent* in it, which must involve them in *eternal ruin* as certainly as God will be *true* to his own *Establishments*. When they can be ours *truly* and *intirely*, we shall be as hearty and forward as any in

congratulating their Reception. But 'till they can be so, the receiving them *occasionally*, on Terms *destructive* of *Discipline*, will ruin more Souls than it can pretend to *preserve*. Nor can it indeed serve the *Interests*, even of their *own Souls*, 'till they can join us on *uniting Principles* obliging them in *Conscience*, without any regard to the *State*. And when they can come to such *Principles*, they will not *themselves* be content to *communicate* with us only *occasionally*. These are no other Terms than what do as well *become* your *Episcopal Function* to *grant* us, as us to *crave* them. God incline you for your *own* sake so to do.

6 AP 58

F I N I S.

Some

Some Books Printed for
Samuel Keble, *at the*
Turk's Head *in Fleet-*
street.

A Practical Discourse on the Lord's Day, with Devotions proper for the Day; by *John Howell*, A. M. a Presbyter of the Church of *England*.

Meditations upon Living Holy and Dying Happily; with suitable Prayers at the end of each Chapter. Written originally in *Latin*, by that learned Physician *Daniel Sennertus*, and now translated into *English*. The Second Edition.

Occasional Conformity a most unjustifiable Practice, in Answer to a late Pamphlet intituled, *Moderation a Virtue*; with a short Vindication of the Church of *England* from that Author's groundless Reasons for Separation, and a Postscript in Answer to the Eleventh Section of Dr. *Davenant's* Essays of Peace at Home and War Abroad.

The

Books Printed for S. Keble.

The Royal Censure of Partial Conformity truly representing the Case of Churchmen and Dissenters in the Time of King *James I.* in his Proclamations, Declarations, and Conferences relating thereunto.

Naaman Vindicated as well from the Idolatries of the House of *Rimmon* in *Syria*, as from the Abuses and Hypocrites in the Christian World; by *Richard Peirson*, Priest of the Church of *England*.

Confession of Sins and the Power of Absolution, in a Sermon Preach'd to the University of *Cambridge* in the Year 1637. by *Anthony Sparrow*, D.D. sometime Master of Queens College, *Cambridge*, and afterwards Bishop of *Norwich*.

A Treatise of God's Government, and of the Justice of his present Dispensations in this World; by the Pious, most Learned and Eloquent *Salvian*, a Priest of *Marseile*, who liv'd in the Fifth Century. Translated by *R. T.* a Presbyter of the Church of *England*, with a Preface by the Reverend Mr. *Wagstaff*.

BOOKS

BOOKS Printed for and Sold by
Richard Smith, at the Angel
and Bible without Temple-Bar,
and in the Inner Lower Walk of
Exeter Exchange in the Strand.

Georgii Bulli S. T. P. & Presby-
teri Anglicani, Opera Omnia,
quibus duo Præcipui Catholicæ Fidei
Articuli, de S. Trinitate & Justifica-
tione Orthodoxè, Perspicuè, ac Solidè
Explanantur, Illustrantur, Confirman-
tur. Nunc demum in unum Volumen
Collecta ac multo correctius quàm an-
tè unà cum Generalibus Indicibus E-
dita. Quibus jam accessit ejusdem
Tractatus hæctenus ineditus, *De Pri-
mitiva & Apostolica Traditione Dog-
matis de Jesu Christi Divinitate*, con-
tra *Danielem Zuickerum*, Ejusque Nu-
peros in Anglia Sectatores; Subnexa
insuper pluribus Singulorum Librorum
capitibus proluxa quandoque *Annotata*
Joannis Ernesti Grabe, cujus etiam
Præfatio huic Volumini est Præmissa.
Fol. Pret. 1 l. 10 s.

De Nupero Schismate *Anglicano*
Parænesis ad *Exteros* tam Reformatos
quam etiam Pontificios quâ, Jura E-
piscoporum vetera, eorundemque a
ma-

Books Printed for R. Smith:

magistratu Seculari Independentia omnibus asserenda commendantur. Ab *Henrico Dodwello*, A. M. Pret. 4s.

Exercitationes Duæ; Prima, de *Ætate Phalaridis*; Secunda, de *Ætate Pythagoræ* Philosophi. Ab *Henrico Dodwello*, A. M. Pret. 4s.

There is now Publish'd the New Translation of *C. Julius Cæsar's* Commentaries of his Wars in *Gaul*, and Civil War with *Pompey*. To which is added *Aulus Hirtius* or *Oppius's* Supplement of the *Alexandrian, African* and *Spanish* Wars. With the Author's Life. Adorn'd with Sculptures from the Designs of the Famous *Palladio*. Made *English* from the Original *Latin*, and illustrated with Notes; by *Martin Bladen*, Gent. Dedicated to His Excellency the Duke of *Marlborough*. 8vo. Price 8s.

A Paraphrase and Annotations upon all *St. Paul's* Epistles, done by several Eminent Men at *Oxford*, Corrected and Improv'd by the late Right Reverend and Learned Bishop *Fell*. The Third Edition with Additions. 8vo. Price 6s. 6 AP 58

F I N I S.

